Vol. LXXIV, No. 4 April, 1926

The Ecclesiastical Review

A Monthly Publication for the Clergy Cum Approbatione Superiorum

CONTENTS

THE EASTER PSALTER IN THE ROMAN BREVIARY 337
FRA ARMINIO.
BREVIARIUM ROMANUM. 342
The Very Rev. CHARLES L. O'DONNELL, C S C., Notre Dame, Indiana.
THE COUNCIL OF TRENT AND THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS 342
The Right Rev. ALEXANDER MacDONALD, D.D., Toronto, Ont., Canada.
THE LITURGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF FLOWERS 351
The Rev. ISIDORE OBERHAUSER, C PP.S., Carthagena, Ohio.
THE SUNDAY EPISTLES AND GOSPELS 356
The Rev. GEORGE O'NEILL, S J., M.A., Werribee, Victoria, Australia.
THE VOW OF CHASTITY IN THE SUBDIACONATE 361
The Rev. EDWARD J. MAHONEY. D.D., Ware, England.
THE ARCHBISHOP'S POCKET-BOOK 371
THE SACRED AND THE SECULAR IN ORGANIZED CHARITY 381
The Rev. JOHN R. MacDONALD, Georgeville, N. S., Canada.
THE SACRIFICE OF CALVARY
I. Was Christ's Sacrifice Finished on Calvary? 403
II. The Sacrifice of Calvary Operative in the Mass. 406
The Right Rev. ALEXANDER MacDONALD, D.D., Toronto, Ont., Canada.
IS THE INVOCATION "REGINA PACIS" PERMANENT? 407
THE LAW OF FAST ON TITULAR FEASTS 408
ST. AUGUSTINE'S UNDERSTANDING OF JACOB'S LIE 410
PEW RENT AND DOMICILE 413
IMPEDIMENTUM IMMEDIATE ANTE NUPTIAS CONTRAHENDAS DETECTUM. 418
RECENT HYMNOLOGY. 420
The Right Rev. Monsignor H. T. HENRY, Litt.D., Washington, D. C.

CONTENTS CONTINUED INSIDE

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

PUBLISHED AT
113 E. Chestnut Street
Lancaster, Pa.

THE DOLPHIN PRESS
Philadelphia

GENERAL OFFICES
1305 Arch Street
Philadelphia, Pa.

Copyright, 1926: American Ecclesiastical Review—The Dolphin Press

Subscription Price: United States and Canada, $4.00—Foreign Postage, $1.00 additional

Sole Agents { Great Britain: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 8 Paternoster Row, London, E. C., 4
Ireland: Catholic Truth Society of Ireland, 24 Upper O'Connell St., Dublin
Australia: W. P. Linehan, 3 Bourke St., Melbourne

Entered, 2 July, 1924, as Second Class Matter, Post Office at Lancaster, Pa., under Act of 3 March, 1879

BROTHERHOOD CORPORATION

L. L. FARRELL (President)

Vineyards:

Washingtonville, Est. 1839
Livermore, California

Address all communications to:

New York Office
71 Barclay Street

Producers of the Finest Altar Wines in America

The Brotherhood is one of the oldest and largest Altar wine houses in this country. We allow no dealers to handle our Altar wines, all shipments being made direct to the Reverend Clergy from our vineyards at Washingtonville, New York.

Mr. L. L. Farrell, the President, has devoted his entire life to the Altar wine industry, and all shipments are made under his personal supervision.

Requests for price lists and application blanks will have prompt attention

Altar Wine Supremacy

SINCE 1877

The COVICK Altar Wines are produced in California and are the only wines having the unqualified approval and commendation of all the Bishops of California.

✢ ✢ ✢

The Chancellor of the San Francisco Archdiocese supervises the making and distribution of the COVICK wines under the authority of His Grace the Most Reverend Archbishop.

The COVICK wines are not only valid and licit matter for the Holy Sacrifice; they are mature wines of the very highest grade and dependability.

✢ ✢ ✢

The COVICK altar wines, because of their rich mellow wholesome character are the ideal wines for the fasting priest and no wines anywhere in America are comparable with them.

✢ ✢ ✢

For the convenience of the Clergy throughout the country the COVICK Mass Wines may be obtained from

The T. F. Rodden Agency
25 Barclay Street
New York City, N. Y.

Fee Brothers
21-27 North Water Street
Rochester, N. Y.

Sievers Church Goods Co.
228 East Commerce Street
San Antonio, Texas

The I. Donnelly Company
408-410 East Ninth Street
Kansas City, Mo.

William Moran Agency
873 Payne Avenue
St. Paul, Minn.

or direct from

The Covick Company
216 Pine Street
San Francisco, Cal.

The Covick Company

Established 1877 **Incorporated 1900**

ANALECTA:

ACTA PII PP. XI:

Motu Proprio de Pontificia Commissione Sacrae Archaeologiae deque Novo Pontificio Instituto Archaeologiae Christianae 386

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE RELIGIOSIS:

Declaratio circa Naturam Iuridicam Congregationis Sororum a Misericordia (Sisters of Mercy) 393

S. CONGREGATIO RITUUM:

I. Dubia Liturgica 394

II. Dubia de Responsoriis Primi Nocturni et de Evangelio Dominicae in Fine Missae 396

III. Dubium de Forma Paramentorum 397

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE DISCIPLINA SACRAMENTORUM:

De Patrinis Baptismatis 398

SACRA POENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA:

Dubium circa Coronas ex Vitro Confectas 400

DIARIUM CURIAE ROMANAE:

List of Recent Pontifical Appointments 401

STUDIES AND CONFERENCES:

Our Analecta—Roman Documents for the Month 403

The Sacrifice of Calvary:

I. Was Christ's Sacrifice Finished on Calvary ? 403

II. The Sacrifice of Calvary Operative in the Mass 406

(*The Right Rev. Alexander MacDonald, D.D., Toronto, Canada*).

Is the Invocation "Regina Pacis" Permanent ? 407

The Law of Fast on Titular Feasts 408

St. Augustine's Understanding of Jacob's Lie 410

Ceremonial for Congregation at Mass 411

Application of the "Pauline Privilege" 411

Pew Rent and Domicile 413

Indulgences on Translated Feast 414

The Baltimore Council and the New Code 414

Kissing the Bishop's Ring at Communion 414

Private Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament 415

Attending Mass out of the Parish 415

The Clerical Shaver 417

Impedimentum immediate ante Nuptias contrahendas detectum 418

Out-Door Stations of the Cross 419

ECCLESIASTICAL LIBRARY TABLE:

Recent Hymnology. (*The Right Rev. Monsignor H. T. Henry, Litt.D., Washington, D. C.*)

CRITICISMS AND NOTES:

Garrigou-Lagrange: Theologia Fundamentalis de Revelatione 429

Cordovani: Il Rivelatore 429

Negueruela: Espiritualismo—Christianismo—Catolicismo 429

Balfour et al.: Science, Religion, and Reality 433

Mathews et al.: Contributions of Science to Religion 433

Watson: Science as Revelation 433

Williamson: One Real Thing 438

Schuster: The Sacramentary 439

Harrington: Catholicism, Capitalism or Communism 440

LITERARY CHAT ..... 442 **BOOKS RECEIVED** 446

Firms With Episcopal Authorization to Handle Sacred Vessels to Repair Them

BALTIMORE:	JOHN MURPHY CO., Park Avenue and Clay Street.
BOSTON:	BIGELOW KENNARD & CO., 511 Washington Street. THOS. J. FLYNN & CO., 62-64 Essex Street. MATTHEW F. SHEEHAN COMPANY, 17 and 19 Beach St. PATRICK J. GILL, 387 Washington Street.
CHICAGO:	BENZIGER BROTHERS, 205-207 W. Washington Street. (Factory in De Kalb Avenue and Rockwell Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.) JOHN P. DALEIDEN CO., 1530-32 Sedgwick Street. ECCLESIASTICAL GOODS CO., 984 Milwaukee Ave. D. B. HANSEN & SONS, 27 N. Franklin Street. EDWARD J. KOENIG COMPANY, 10 South La Salle Street. MATRE & CO., 33-35 S. Wells Street. SPAULDING & CO., Michigan Avenue and Van Buren St.
CINCINNATI:	BENZIGER BROTHERS, 429 Main Street. (Factory in De Kalb Avenue and Rockwell Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.) FR. PUSTET CO., 436 Main Street.
CLEVELAND:	NORTHERN OHIO PLATING WORKS, 1501 Columbus Road.
DENVER:	JAMES CLARKE CHURCH GOODS HOUSE, 1638-40 Tremont St.
LOS ANGELES:	EDWARD J. KOENIG COMPANY, 1107 South Main Street.
MILWAUKEE:	BERGS MANUFACTURING CO., 483-485 Twenty-seventh Street. DIEDERICH-SCHAEFER CO., 413 Broadway. A. WERNER, 649 E. Water Street.
NEW YORK:	BENZIGER BROTHERS, 36-38 Barclay Street. (Factory in De Kalb Avenue and Rockwell Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.) THE FEELEY CO., 10 W. 50th Street. THE GORHAM COMPANY, 5th Avenue and 47th Street. P. J. KENEDY & SONS, 44 Barclay Street. FR. PUSTET CO., 52 Barclay Street. RAMBUSCH DECORATING CO., 2 West 45th Street. THE C. WILDERMANN CO., 33 Barclay Street.
OMAHA:	KOLEY AND SON, 2910 Farnam Street.
PHILADELPHIA:	H. L. KILNER, & CO., 1708 Market Street. J. J. McDERMOTT, Room 818, 1011 Chestnut Street. F. C. PEQUIGNOT, 1331 Walnut Street. FRANK QUIN & CO., 46 North 9th Street. HERMAN J. WOLF, 539-543 W. Huntingdon Street. WRIGHT MANUFACTURING CO., 127-35 Master Street.
PITTSBURGH:	E. J. LETZKUS, 2006 Jenkins Arcade.
PROVIDENCE:	THE GORHAM COMPANY, Elmwood. W. J. SULLIVAN CO., 96 Jefferson Street. JOSEPH TALLY, 506-512 Westminster Street.
SEATTLE:	THE KAUFER CO., 1607 Fourth Avenue.
ST. LOUIS:	B. HERDER BOOK CO., 17 South Broadway. MUELLER PLATING CO., 920 Pine St., Imperial Bldg.
ST. PAUL:	THE E. M. LOHMANN CO., 385 St. Peter St.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

EIGHTH SERIES.—VOL. IV.—(LXXIV).—APRIL, 1926.—No. 4.

THE EASTER PSALTER IN THE ROMAN BREVIARY.

THE Resurrection of our Lord marked the triumphant opening of a new era in the history of the world, as it brought the fulfilment of the Messianic promises as well as the establishment of the prophetic Jerusalem—the Catholic Church. The earliest indications of Christian liturgy bear testimony to this fact. Not only was Easter with its Alleluiah chants the one great feast of universal joy, but every Sunday throughout the year became an echo of that joy, as being the *Dies Dominica*.[1]

The Easter joy is quickened by the penitential preparation of Lent and Passiontide. The latter is but a period of purification in which we recall the trial and failure of Good Friday as a prelude to the Paschal triumph. In the primitive Church the thought of it was continually recalled to the memory of the faithful throughout the year by the weekly fasts of Wednesday and Friday as a preparation for the following Sunday.

In the recitation of the Breviary, during the Easter cycle, the Church seeks to interpret the liturgy centering in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, so that the priest may put himself, from Holy Thursday on, in the proper attitude of mind and heart for the celebration of Easter.

The Matin Hours, commemorating the institution of the Holy Eucharist, open with the sixty-eighth Psalm, and run in the regular order of the Gallican or Vulgate Psalter down

[1] "Idcirco et diem octavum in laetitia agimus, quo et Jesus resurrexit a mortuis." (*Epist. Barnabae* 15:9).

to and including the seventy-sixth Psalm. The psalmist pours out his heart in a penitential cry (68-69), followed by a note of hope in the Redemption (70). Suddenly there comes to him the Vision of Christ the Messias (71), ending in a doxology. It is a picture of the ideal kingdom through Solomon, the son of David from whose race the Christ is to spring.

With the realization of this hope the Hebrew interpreter in the royal house, Asaph, reminds us of the plan of God respecting His chosen people, the promise of reward for fidelity; but also the sad consequence of sin and the retribution under which Israel is to fall. Once more follows prayer in hope; then gratitude for the blessings of faith and an invocation of God's mercy in behalf of His faithful.

Such is the burden of the nine psalms that make up the morning prayer of the Church on Holy Thursday. The triple pause in the musical chant which the Psalter implies, is marked by the reading of the Lamentations of Jeremias for the first Nocturn. The second night-watch concludes with the reading from St. Augustine's Tract on the Psalms. The third chant of psalms leads up to a reading of the account of the Last Supper, the institution of the Holy Eucharist, from St. Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians.

For Good Friday and Holy Saturday we have a different note. The Psalms intone a dramatic presentation of the turbulent hostility to the Christ at His coming (Ps. 2). Then follows a lament (Ps. 21), and patient trust in the Lord (Ps. 26). In the next Psalm (37) we make a confession of sin and a resolve to obey the voice of the Lord (29). This chant is echoed by the Sons of Korah and Heman, the Ezrahite, and ends with a prayer for help (Pss. 53-58). The conclusion of the Friday Matin service is a profession of faith in the true God, and a repudiation of all that may withdraw us from His ways.

The Holy Saturday Office likewise opens with a penitential prayer (Ps. 4), and is followed by a hymn proclaiming the true worship of the Lord in His Temple and confidence in His protection for those dwelling therein (Pss. 14-15). Next there is a glance at the Tabernacle, the Holy Mount to be approached with clean hands and pure heart (Ps. 23), with a vote of thanks for the privilege of dwelling in the sanctuary

and being chosen for His service (Pss. 26-29). The last Nocturn begins also with a prayer and a protest against the wiles of those who persecute the Holy One of Israel and His anointed, after which comes a profession of absolute trust in God, our Saviour, despite the machinations of the enemy (Pss. 53, 75, 87). The intervening readings which break the current of the psalm chant are, as in the liturgy of Holy Thursday, a plaint and warning taken from the Lament of Jeremias, followed by a reading from St. Augustine interpreting the Psalm, and an historic record containing the Pauline interpretation of the Old Testament sacrifice applied to the Passion of Christ and the institution of the Holy Sacrifice, in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The intermediate services of Lauds and Vespers contain psalms of thanksgiving, some of which belong to the Gradual songs of the Ascent to Jerusalem, others to the Hallel forms, suggesting the institution of the Holy Eucharist and anticipating the Paschal triumph and joy of the morrow.

The Easter gladness and gratitude find inspired expression in the one brief Nocturn which comprises the first three Psalms of the Davidic chant book. These songs take on a new significance in the light of the Resurrection. The first chant tells of the true happiness that grows out of the Saviour's way, bearing fruit in its season like a tree by the water-side (Ps. 1). The second Psalm marks the vain strife of the world against the royal reign of Jesus Christ who has taken on our humanity and restored our inheritance on Resurrection Day (Ps. 3). Note the emphasis:

I. Ps.—Beatus vir qui non abiit in consilio, etc.
II. Ps.—Fremuerunt gentes — astiterunt reges terrae adversus *Christum* ejus. Tunc loquetur:
Ego *constitutus sum Rex* super Sion montem sanctum ejus, praedicans praeceptum ejus.
III. Ps.—Ego *dormivi* et soporatus sum *et exsurrexi,* quia Dominus suscepit me.
(Doxology)—Domini est salus et super populum benedictio.

So runs the chant introducing the announcement of the glad tidings of the Resurrection to Magdalen, Mary of James, and Salome, in the brief style of St. Mark's Gospel; commented on in the Homily of St. Gregory, "Audistis".

After the *Jubilate* of Easter Sunday and throughout the entire octave the chant of the Alleluiah continues, breaking in on meditation, repeating itself in refrains, and making hymns of antiphon and prayer. Then on the eighth day the three Nocturn prayer is resumed, continually repeating, until Trinity Sunday, the message of the Alleluiah and verifying the contagion of gladness

Gavisi sunt discipuli quia surrexit Dominus

and proclaiming the message of joy to all the world

Haec dies quam fecit Dominus: exultemus et laetemur in ea.

Every Sunday, except the Sundays following in the period which serves as an introduction to the Easter cycle (and later, when the Church came to celebrate with a like preparation the Advent of the Messias at Christmas), is made to reannounce the glory of the Day which the Lord made. This explains the departure to some extent of the Church of Christ from the Hebrew liturgy of the Paschal celebration, at least in so far as the so-called Hallel Psalms of the Temple and synagogal service do not recur in the same fashion as they did in the Jewish Church. They find, however, like all the sacrificial liturgy of the Old Law, an echo or a reflection in the Sacrifice of the Mass; and this not simply as invocations in versicles and responses, but in the Hebrew consecration of the Bread and the Chalice, and in the prayers common to the Hallel celebration on the great festivals of Pasch, Pentecost, Tabernacles, and of the Dedication of the Temple and of the New Moon. The parallel is more easily understood when we compare the solemn ceremonial of the Paschal service among the Jews with the liturgy of the Mass as ushered in with the recitation of the Breviary psalms in the Hours following Matins and Lauds. We recite Prime and Terce as a preparation before, and Sext and None as Thanksgiving after Mass.

In Hebrew communities the "Father" of the family (or group of families) began the Vesper service on the eve of the Pasch with the chanting of Psalms 112 and 113, together with the lesson from the Book of Exodus (12). While all were standing, the head of the household pronounced the thanksgiving—"Deo Gratias", after the reading.

Next followed the oblation of the chalice. The Breaking of Bread was carried out in the following fashion:

1. *Lavabo* (washing of hands);
2. Breaking of the Bread;
3. Elevation of the Bread;
4. Benediction of the same;
5. Communion (eating of the bread and lettuce);
6. Thanksgiving.

The chalice was separately blessed, and four of the Hallel Psalms (114-117) were chanted in the meanwhile. The entire service terminated with the great Hallel Psalm (135), much like the *Te Deum* of the Catholic service on solemn feasts to-day.

It is not necessary to point out to the clerical reader the close resemblance between this ceremonial and that of the New Law. The resemblance goes even farther and includes the particular form of prayers in the Canon of the Mass. Thus the Hebrew Paschal liturgy adopts the customary orations in the name of the Church, when it prays in Psalm 114—

1. for the priest; and
2. for the neophytes—converts (11-13);
3. for the children and youth (13-14);
4. for the extirpation of heresies (8);
5. for temporal prosperity and peace (15-16).

The contents of Psalms 116 and 117 recall the chants of the Preface and the "Sursum Corda" with which the priest at Mass invites the faithful.

Thus the Hallel Psalms are incorporated in the Mass of the Easter cycle, while the Gradual chants, which the devout Hebrew sang on his pilgrimage to Jerusalem or on the ascent of the Temple steps, recur in the Breviary Office as a preparation for the solemn Sacrifice *in Monte Sion,* and bid us recite the Psalter with a devout thoughtfulness.

FRA ARMINIO.

BREVIARIUM ROMANUM.

This is my country, and a pleasant land
  Of winter, spring, summer and autumn time,
  Four-winded and four-walled, a changing clime
Lit by eternal stars, constantly fanned
By delicate breaths of Eden. I know who planned
  This terrain like a garden, like a chime
  Of answering bells, who matched a golden rhyme
Of earth and heaven in these volumes spanned.

League upon league I travel every year
  And in the valley, on the mountain rim,
    In winter starlight, or the summer air,
I meet great persons of the past and hear
  David, Augustine, Bernard, ah! and Him
    Who walks this world—that He has made—of prayer.

CHARLES L. O'DONNELL, C.S.C.

Notre Dame, Indiana.

THE COUNCIL OF TRENT AND THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

THE decrees of the Council of Trent respecting the Mass are in the nature of a preamble to the canons. The aim of the Council was to meet the current errors and define the Catholic doctrine as against these. The Fathers, as the historians of the Council remind us, forbore entering upon or attempting to settle questions that were in dispute among Catholic theologians. They felt it was no time for civil war when the enemy was at the gate. Thirteen propositions were taken from the works of the early Reformers and submitted to scrutiny. These were fused into the nine statements on this subject that are condemned. Whatever discussion there was about the nature of the sacrifice offered in the Mass, or the relation of the Last Supper to the Cross, was purely incidental, as not falling within the scope of the decrees. It is important to note this when there is question of their meaning. The decrees cannot be interpreted as deciding either of these questions, for the simple reason that this was foreign to the purpose of those who drafted and passed them.

I have lately given some time to a sifting and analysis of the discussions that preceded the passing of the Tridentine decrees

and canons on the Mass. They are to be found in the *Acta Genuina Concilii Tridentini* (tom. 2, pp. 58 ff.) and now in Eheses.[1] Pallavicini and Sarpi also present a report of them, but it is somewhat meagre and for the most part in their own words. These discussions are the historic and theological background of the decrees, which have to be read and construed in the light of them.

The questions that the discussion turned chiefly upon were these five:

1. Is the Mass a mere commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross?
2. Is the Mass derogatory to the Sacrifice of the Cross?
3. Is the Mass merely a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving?
4. Is the offering in the Mass nothing else but that Christ is given us in the guise of bread?
5. Did Christ in the words, *Do this for a commemoration of me,* ordain that the Apostles should offer His Body and Blood in the Mass?

The Fathers were of one mind regarding these and other points embodied in the canons. There was, in like manner, agreement that the reason the Mass is not derogatory to the Sacrifice of Calvary is that it is the same sacrifice, though the manner of offering is different. In the discussions the word "modus" appears, while it is "ratio" we have in the decree. The meaning, however, is the same; and it is plain that, in the mind of the Council, there is but a modal difference between the Mass and its prototype, which accords with the tradition of the Church that the Mass is, in substance and essence, the same sacrifice as that of Calvary.

In the first draft of the decrees there was no mention of the fact that Christ offered Himself in the Supper. The Council ordered it to be added. Sarpi says that no fewer than twenty-three prelates objected to the clause that our Lord offered Himself in the Supper, and that others were of the opinion that this should not be affirmed even if it were true. In the end it was affirmed in set terms. But both Pallavicini[2] and Waterworth[3] inform us that it was agreed no mention should be made of the

[1] *Conc. Trid. Diar.* etc., tom. 8, pp. 755-788.

[2] Bk. 18, ch. 5, n. 3.

[3] *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent.*

nature of that offering. The words of the latter are cited in the REVIEW of August, p. 172. This fact is to be carefully kept in mind, lest any one should presume to gather from the wording of the decrees that the Supper was a complete sacrifice, or that it was other than the Sacrifice of the Cross.

According to Sarpi,[4] Salmeron, the great Jesuit theologian, maintained that there was a complete sacrifice in the Supper, and that it was propitiatory. Against him the Bishops of Chiozza and Veglia argued that, if this were so, we should have been redeemed by that sacrifice, and not by that of the Cross, to which Scripture attributes our redemption. They added, according to the same writer, that to say it was one and the same sacrifice which was begun in the Supper and finished on Calvary was to say what is contradictory, to wit, that the beginning of a sacrifice is a sacrifice. But this is to ignore the fact that in every sacrifice there is a twofold element, the action of the priest in offering it and the immolation of the victim. The former was begun in the Supper and the latter consummated on the Cross. It would be absurd to say that the beginning of a sacrifice is a sacrifice. But it is the simple truth to say that beginning and ending make one sacrifice. So say, as we shall see, the overwhelming majority of the Fathers who touched upon this point at Trent.

To understand the attitude of these two Bishops we must remember that they, at first, wished the Council to refrain from defining the sacrificial offering in the Supper as not being clearly affirmed in the Gospels or by St. Paul, as being a moot point in the theology of the time, as seeming to deny the ransom of the Cross. See *The Sacrifice of the Mass* by the present writer, page 49. They thus opposed the few who maintained that there was a complete sacrifice in the Supper as well as the far greater number who taught that the sacrifice was begun in the Supper and finished on the Cross. Their idea was that the Sacrifice of the Mass should be rested solely on Apostolical Tradition.

In all, one hundred and fifty-seven prelates spoke on the Mass at the Council. On careful analysis of the discussions I find that one hundred and two either said nothing at all about the relation of the Supper to the Cross or spoke so ob-

[4] *Hist. of the C. of T.*, in French translation, p. 539.

scurely that one cannot say precisely what was in their mind. Most of them gave their whole attention to the other questions that were set before them. As many as forty-three affirmed in terms or equivalently that our Lord offered in the Supper the Sacrifice He consummated on the Cross, and that the Supper and the Cross are therefore one and the same sacrifice. The remaining twelve were of the opinion that our Lord offered in the Supper a sacrifice other than that which He consummated on the Cross. But they did not agree as to the nature of that sacrifice. Archbishop Bartholomew, O.P., of Bracan in Lusitania, held that the Supper was a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, but not of expiation, at any rate, not certainly so. This opinion was ruled out, and the sacrifice declared propitiatory. Bishop Thomas Cassellus, O. P., (Cavensis junior), and the Abbot of the Lateran maintained that the Sacrifice of the Cross was according to the rite of Aaron. This view is the logical consequence of the theory that in the Supper there was offered a complete sacrifice, but it, too, was ruled out, doubtless as being in too patent contradiction to the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Spanish Bishop, Andreas de Cuesta, and a couple of others expressly affirmed that the mystic immolation makes the Mass a sacrifice, thus putting forward a view that has found favor with many post-Tridentine theologians. But if the mystic immolation makes the Mass a sacrifice, it also made the Supper a sacrifice, and the objection urged against Salmeron by the Bishops of Chiozza and Veglia recurs, namely, that we should in that case have been redeemed in the Supper, whereas it was on Calvary that the handwriting decree which stood against us was blotted out. Alive to the force of this objection, the Father General of the Minor Conventuals said the Supper was a propitiatory sacrifice, but not redemptive. He was alone in this; and his view embodies a distinction without a difference. St. Paul says that God set forth His Son "to be a propitiation through faith in His Blood" (Rom. 3:25), and St. John that "He is a propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but for those of the whole world" (1 Jo. 2:2). If the Supper was a propitiation at all, it was a propitiation for the sins of the whole world, and the world was then redeemed. As St. Augustine observes, "That by which Satan held us was wiped out by the Blood of

the Redeemer. For he held us not but by the bonds of our sins. These were the captive's chains."

One of those who maintained that there was a complete sacrifice in the Supper was Lainez, the second General of the Jesuits. He same late to the Council, and was the last to speak. He spoke at great length, occupying the whole of a forenoon session. Cardinal Seripand, the Pope's Legate, did not think much of the discourse of Lainez. He seems to have regarded it as being mainly a playing to the gallery. His words are: "Nihil mihi ejus sermo habere visus est supra probabilitatem et inanem quandam apparentiam qua imperito multitudo maxime rapitur."[5] This severe censure notwithstanding, Lainez's discourse shows great erudition. Though he appears to regard the Supper as a sacrifice complete in itself, he never says so in terms, and uses at least one argument which would show that it was not. He is intent throughout on proving that the Mass is a sacrifice, and piles argument upon argument, some good, some not so good. Thus, to show that in the Supper, and consequently in the Mass, there is a propitiatory sacrifice, he argues: "Et si erat [coena] initium passionis, ergo expiavit—And if the Supper was the beginning of the Passion, it was therefore propitiatory." This is neither logically nor theologically sound. The logical consequence is that the Supper, being the beginning of the Passion, is also the beginning of the propitiatory sacrifice. Voicing the ancient tradition of the Church, St. Cyprian says that "The Passion of the Lord is the Sacrifice we offer"; the Passion, mark you, not the beginning of the Passion, which was in the Supper. Therefore there is in the Mass more than was in the Supper, not the beginning only but the whole of the Passion, and so the Mass binds into one both the oblation of the Supper and the immolation of the Cross. This is the logic as well as the theology of the thing.

It will be observed that the views put forward by the minority about the Supper are multifold and divergent. Some would have it to be a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, not propitiatory: one would have it propitiatory, but not redemptive; others, a sacrifice according to the rite of Melchisedech, in contradistinction to the Cross which would be according to

[5] Ehses, loc. cit., f. 2, p. 788.

the rite of Aaron; still others, a sacrifice in virtue of the mystical immolation. This, of course, would give us a mystical sacrifice only. Our Lord offered in the Supper not the semblance, not the shadow, of a sacrifice, but the reality. Sacrifice, in its essential concept, involves the depriving oneself and handing over to God of something precious, and the most precious thing of all was the life that our Lord gave a ransom for many. This is what He offered in sacrifice.

There is striking accord in the statements of the other Fathers who spoke at Trent of the relation of the Supper to the Cross, and who form the great majority of the speakers on that subject. A certain number content themselves with saying that they agree with such or such a one of the Fathers who preceded. Thus, the Bishop of Assisi "probat sententiam Leriensis"; and the Bishop of Auxerre "est in voto Parisiensis". Far the greater number, however, give their "votum" or judgment in express words, and for the most part, briefly. These fall into two groups, some declaring that the Supper is one sacrifice with the Cross, others that Christ began His Sacrifice in the Supper and finished it on the Cross. Let me give citations, beginning with the former group.

Mgr. de Bellay, Bishop of Paris, with whom the Bishop of Auxerre expressed agreement: "They are not two sacrifices, but the Supper is one with the Cross."

Mgr. Gaspar de Casal of the Hermits of St. Augustine, Bishop of Lero in Malta (Leriensis), with whom the Bishop of Assisi concurred: "The one is never to be separated from the other, and so the Supper is propitiatory even as is the Cross."

Mgr. Baldinus (Lerinensis): "They are one oblation, that is one sacrifice; and besides the Passion of Christ was not over in an instant but took time."

The Bishop of Campania (Campaniensis); "The oblation in the Supper is one and the same with that of the Cross."

The Bishop of Viviers (Vivariensis): "The Supper is one and the same sacrifice with that of the Cross."

Mgr. Mugatones (Sigobricensis): "Nor does it follow from this [viz. the propitiatory character of the Supper] that our redemption would have been wrought before the Sacrifice of the Cross, for the offering in the Supper was directed to the Sacrifice of the Cross and was not separate from it."

Mgr. Ciarelia (Buduensis): "The Sacrifice in the Supper was the same with that of the Cross."

Niochensis: "The Supper was the same sacrifice as that of the Cross, which was then begun."

But enough of these. And now for the other group.

The Archbishop of Palermo (Panormitanus), with whom at least two others professed to be in agreement: "Christ then began to offer Himself, but consummated [His Sacrifice] on the Cross." Note the words "began to offer Himself", for He was still offering Himself on the Cross and continues to do so in the Mass.

Chironensis: "He began [His Sacrifice] in the Supper, and consummated it on the Cross."

Mgr. de Contreras, Bishop of Vich (Vicensis): "In the Supper He began, on the Cross He consummated."

Calubriensis: "There is the same Victim in the Supper and on the Cross; the Sacrifice is one, namely, that of the Cross, which was begun in the Supper and finished on the Cross."

The Bishop of Teano, now Calvi in S. Italy (Theanensis), expresses agreement with a preceding prelate, and adds: "For the Passion of Christ began on the fourteenth day of the moon [i. e. in the Supper] as St. Thomas teaches, 3ª. q. 46, a. 9." St. Thomas, in this place (ad 1^{um}) cites with approval the following passage from St. Bede the Venerable: "Though Christ, who is our Pasch, was crucified the following day, yet in the night on which the Paschal lamb was immolated, delivering to His disciples the mystery of His Body and Blood to be celebrated, and being seized and bound by the Jews, He consecrated the commencement of His immolation, that is, of His Passion." Here, once more, Christ's immolation, Christ's sacrifice, is His Passion, which He inaugurates in the Supper. It may not be out of place to point out that He really does this on the very day of His death, according to the Jewish mode of reckoning, from sunset to sunset.

Bishop Simon de Negris, of Sargana, now Luni-Sargana, in Liguria (Sarzanensis), confutes by anticipation the argument of Lainez that the Supper by itself was a propitiatory sacrifice inasmuch as the Passion had its beginning there. "The beginning," he observes, "puts nothing in the actuality of the consummation (nihil ponit in esse ad consummationem), which took place on the Cross."

Finally, the Patriarch of Jerusalem (Justinopolitanus) and the Bishop of St. Agatha combine the two statements, which are but two ways of saying the same thing. The former has: "The sacrifice in the Supper is the same as that of the Cross, and derives all its efficacy from it. Already Christ [in the Supper] had begun to offer Himself. The sacrifice is one and the same." The Bishop of St. Agatha: "The Supper is the same sacrifice as that of the Cross. For He began in the Supper, and afterward consummated on the Cross."

These two groups speak as with one voice. They do not argue, for faith does not rest on argument, but on Scripture and Tradition. They do not, like the little group of dissentients cited in the first place, put forward views of their own, conflicting theories: they are of one mind and steadfast in a common affirmation. They are the true witnesses for "the faith once delivered to the saints". And it is not a little significant that they all of them are bishops, successors of the Apostles, to whom was committed by Christ the office of teaching and the guardianship of the faith, while in the opposing group are ranged as many as five heads of religious orders, who differ each from the other in their views, and fail to reach a solution of the questions under discussion. These questions, let us call to mind, were particularly the five following:

1. Is the Mass a true sacrifice?
2. Is the Mass derogatory to the Sacrifice of Calvary?
3. Is the Mass a propitiatory sacrifice?
4. Is the Mass primarily the handing over to God of the Victim of Calvary, now glorious and immortal, or the giving to men the Living Bread that came down from Heaven?
5. Did our Lord, in saying "Do this for a commemoration of Me," bid His disciples offer His glorified Body and Blood in the Mass?

Now, if you maintain that there was a complete sacrifice in the Supper, how is it complete without a real immolation? And how, then, is the Mass a true sacrifice? And how is it not derogatory to the Sacrifice of Calvary, if the latter was, as we believe, in itself perfect—a Divine Sacrifice admitting of no addition? And how is the continuation of the sacrifice in the Supper propitiatory? Were there, then, two propitiatory sacrifices? One of the Fathers at the Council (Larinensis)

tells us the Supper was propitiatory "per modum hostiae oblatae in cruce—by way of the sacrifice offered on the Cross." And how is the Mass primarily the handing over to God of the Victim of Calvary, the Sacrifice of our Ransom, which St. Augustine tells us was offered up for the soul of his mother, Monica? Outwardly and on the face of the thing, the Supper was a banquet. If there was no liturgical connexion between the Supper and the Cross, how is the Mass more than this that therein Christ is given us to eat? These are some of the perplexing questions for which the minority view fails to provide a satisfactory answer.

The right answer to these questions is to be found only in the traditional faith of the Church which spoke by the mouths of the forty and odd Fathers at Trent; which found expression again in the declaration of the Council that the Mass differs, not in substance, not in essence, but only in mode, from the Sacrifice of Calvary, the same Christ the Victim, the same Christ now offering by the ministry of His priests; which, in fine, finds classic utterance in these words of Leo XIII, himself a giant in intellect but a child in faith: "Since religious worship must express itself sacrificially, our Divine Redeemer willed that the Sacrifice once consummated on the Cross should be prolonged forever. This is done through the Mass, which is not a mere image or nude memorial of that Sacrifice but the selfsame, though outwardly different." For, since Holy Mass is but the Sacrifice of the Cross perpetuated under the Eucharistic veil, (1) it must needs be a true sacrifice, (2) it cannot be derogatory to the Sacrifice of Calvary, (3) it is a propitiatory sacrifice, (4) it is primarily the handing over to God of the Victim of Calvary, (5) it is offered up in obedience to Christ's command, "Do this in commemoration of Me."

The Archbishop of Toronto once told me that this explanation of the Mass is too simple for theologians. So is the Gospel of Jesus Christ. We have overlaid it with subtleties and complexities. Let your speech be yea yea, nay nay, says the Master. We have traveled far beyond that standard. "Why won't theologians leave us our simple beliefs?" said a nun the other day, and the plaintive query may, *mutato nomine,* be passed on to the critics. The belief of Catholics from the beginning is embalmed in the saying of Augustine that the Sac-

rifice of our Ransom was offered for the soul of his mother. But ever since the sixteenth century, theologians have been telling us, in terms or by necessary implication, that the Mass is a different sacrifice from that of the Cross. In like manner, the belief of Catholics from the beginning has been that the Creed was drawn up by the Twelve Apostles. But certain even of our own Catholic writers tell us to-day that we cannot safely affirm this; or that a guess of the Abbé Fouard's may and, on the whole, ought to be preferred to the age-long tradition of the Catholic Church on this point; or that the Twelve Apostles indeed, may have indicated, article by article, what truths should be incorporated in the Creed, but left it to someone else to embody them in a form of sound words—as if they themselves hadn't the gift of tongues. Why not leave us children of Holy Church the simple beliefs that we sucked in at our Mother's breasts? Why vex with your doubts and perplex with your subtleties us simple folk who would fain remain straightforward of mind and speech in the things that have come down to us through all the generations since the Master taught the multitudes by the Sea of Galilee—who would fain remain little children that so we may enter the Kingdom of Heaven?

THE RIGHT REV. ALEX. MACDONALD.

THE LITURGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF FLOWERS.

I.

FREQUENT references in the writings of the Christian Fathers show that from the earliest ages flowers served as decoration in the churches and on the tombs of martyrs. St. Augustine relates a miracle wrought through flowers placed on the grave of St. Stephen, the proto-martyr. That flowers were regularly used as ornament for the altar does not appear so clearly before the thirteenth century.

The present liturgical law regarding the use of flowers runs parallel with the historical development in the use of flowers as part of the official cult in the Church. To-day flowers are prescribed on certain days for the ornamentation of the church, but there is no general law prescribing that flowers must ever be used as decorations of the altar. The *Ephemerides Litur-*

gicae is authority for the statement that the patriarchal basilicas in Rome and other prominent churches of the Eternal City never have the altars ornamented with flowers. The same may be said of some churches outside of Rome, even in America, especially when the altars are of exceptionally beautiful architecture; flowers, it is judged, often rather hide than enhance the art of the structure.

The Missal, under Title XX, in treating of the "Ornamenta Altaris" does not mention flowers explicitly. The *Caeremoniale Episcoporum,* however, and the *Memoriale Rituum,* and several decrees of the S. C. R. do mention and regulate the use of flowers in the church and on the altar. These sources form the basis for the liturgical use of flowers as "ornamenta altaris".

The *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* prescribes that flowers be used to decorate the entrances of the church on titular and patronal feasts of the church and the locality. Furthermore on Maundy Thursday the place where the *Mandatum* is held is to be decorated with flowers. The *Memoriale Rituum* directs that the place where the Repository is erected for Holy Thursday services, be ornamented with flowers. It would be difficult to find other passages in any of the liturgical books or decrees which unconditionally and absolutely prescribe flowers for the decoration of churches. It may be noted that, while these regulations call for flowers in different parts of the church building, they do not call for them on the sacrificial altar of the same.

The *Memoriale Rituum* makes two references which sanction the use of flowers on the altar—"si moris est" and "si consuetum fuerit". These two sanctions occur in connexion with Holy Saturday services and those of the Feast of the Purification. On the second of February after the Procession, and before the Mass of the Purification follows: "Clericus apponit, si consuetum fuerit, vasa florum inter candelabra". On Holy Saturday: "Ad versum 'Peccatores' . . . vasa florum, si moris est, inter candelabra apponuntur". Whether the clauses "si consuetum fuerit" and "si moris est" refer to a custom in the particular church of using flowers in general, or of using them on these two particular days, is not determined.

On the other hand the *Memoriale* in its regulation for Holy Thursday seems to take for granted that flowers are used on the altar during the Mass, for when speaking of the "Altarium denudatio" it directs the clerics to remove the "vasa florum" from the altar. However, in the same *Memoriale*, when speaking of decorating the altar for the occasion, we find: "Altare solemniter ornatum, et cum pallio albi coloris". It does not mention flowers as a necessary part of the ornatus. By referring to the parallel regulation for Holy Saturday and the second of February we are justified in taking for granted that the implied regulation on Holy Saturday is of the same nature, namely: "si moris est flores apponere".

To conclude, however, from the foregoing that the regulation of the Church forbids the decoration of altars, in a way which suggests the use of flowers, would be unwarranted. The *Caeremoniale* indicates that on certain occasions the altars are to be decorated; for example when the bishop celebrates, and on other solemnities and higher feasts. On these days the altar is to be decorated more solemnly as the time and circumstances may demand. Furthermore the *Codex Iuris Canonici* imposes an obligation upon pastors to have that altar upon which the Blessed Sacrament is reserved decorated more than other altars. To-day we look upon flowers as the usual means of decorating. But flowers are not necessarily the only means. The *Caeremoniale* suggests other articles that may appropriately serve for ornamenting altars, such as relics, candles, and candelabra, lamps, precious vases, becoming and tasteful bunting, wreaths, etc. Flowers are suggested, e. g. for the ornamentation of the ciborium (cupola) of the altar, and the places where the relics of the saints are kept; which places as a matter of fact are, and usually have been, the altars. It is interesting to note that as a rule when the official books enumerate several possible ornamentations for the altar, flowers are mentioned last.

From what has been stated so far we recognize the gradual development in the historical use of flowers in the church, simultaneously with the present liturgical regulation on the subject. Flowers were used to decorate churches, we might say, practically as long as the Church has had her own temples. Flowers have been used on the altar only since about the thir-

teenth century. To-day the use of flowers is prescribed in the church on certain occasions and permitted on the altar. This distinction points out the underlying principle in the development of law, especially liturgical law: a custom first permitted, then insisted upon by explicit regulation.

II.

Since it is clear that flowers are allowed and even explicitly desirable as ornaments on the altar the question arises in what manner they may be used. The classical quotation from the *Caeremoniale* regarding the use of flowers on the altar reads: "Sed et vascula cum flosculis frondibusque odoriferis, seu serico contextis, studiose ornata adhiberi poterunt." Gavantus in his commentary on the rubric says: "Floribus . . . apte et concinne dispositis . . . sive in vasculis elegantibus sive alia ratione, ornari poterunt altaria." Both the *Caeremoniale* and Gavantus speak of flowers in vases ("studiose ornata"). Besides flowers placed "in vasiculis" we may use, as Gavantus explains, flowers on the altar "alia ratione". This would seem to justify the strewing of flowers on the altar step, or attaching them to other parts of the altar. Regarding both instances he says, "floribus apte et concinne dispositis". These words imply a canon of common sense, namely that the placing of the flowers should be appropriate and artistic, so as to inspire devotion, even as everything else in connexion with divine cult should be. The *Codex Iuris Canonici,* speaking of the building and repairing of churches, of the use of statues and pictures, insists that the principles of art and ecclesiastical custom be adhered to; hence here also esthetics and ecclesiastical custom should be followed.

As to the kind of flowers allowed on the altar the *Caeremoniale* prescribes: "Flosculis frondibusque odoriferis, seu serico contextis". By "odoriferis" we understand natural and fresh flowers; withered flowers are no proper ornamentation for the house of God. There is no distinction made between cut and potted flowers in becoming vessels.

The "serico contextis" is generally interpreted to mean not only silk artificial flowers, but artificial flowers in general. It might be interesting to know that the Apostolic Visitator of the churches in Rome some years ago condemned artificial paper

flowers as unliturgical for the altar. The *Ephemerides Liturgicae* explicitly approves artificial flowers made of stronger substances, such as cloth, porcelain, wax, and the like.

As to the question where the flowers may be placed on the altar, the above-mentioned Roman periodical states: "vel inter candelabra, vel super altaris gradus, vel in ipsa altaris mensa, non autem ante ostiolum tabernaculi ubi SS. Sacramentum asservatur". That "inter candelabra" is a befitting place liturgically is plain from the *Memoriale Rituum* (Tit. VI, cap. II, § VI, n. 2) which explicitly speaks of "vasa florum . . . inter candelabra". The *Caeremoniale* leads to the same conclusion. Gavantus, however, speaks of the flowers as "apte et concinne dispositis". If flowers were allowed merely between the candelabra, this remark would be unnecessary.

That flowers may be placed even on the "mensa altaris" may be gleaned again from the *Caeremoniale*. "Ubi lex non distinguit nec nos distinguere debemus." Furthermore, there is no decree forbidding it. Lastly, Title XX of the Missal seems to point to the same conclusion. It reads: "Super altare nihil omnino ponatur quod ad Missae sacrificium vel ipsius ornatum non pertineat". From other liturgical books we know that at stated times flowers may form a legitimate "ornatus altaris". On the other hand, the Missal does not speak of the *gradus* at all; it mentions in a preceding sentence that the altar be covered with three linens; in this instance all agree that the *mensa* is meant; there is no reason to demand that when treating of the "ornatus altaris", by the word "altare" the Missal means "gradus altaris", any more than when in a few sentences before this, the regulation is given that the "altare" be covered "tribus mappis".

III.

Flowers are not to be placed in front of the tabernacle in which the Blessed Sacrament is reserved. This prohibition is contained in a special decision of the Sacred Congregation of Rites.

Even as liturgical law does prescribe decorations on the altar and encourages the use of flowers on feast days and solemn occasions, so also does it strictly prohibit the same on other occasions and during certain functions. From the several official books and decrees we draw the following conclusions:

Flowers are not to be on the altar—

1. During Mass and Divine Office de Tempore in Lent and Advent. Exceptions are allowed (a) the fourth Sunday of Lent; (b) the third Sunday of Advent, including the days of the week following upon which the Mass of the foregoing Sunday is the Mass *de die;* (c) Maundy Thursday and Holy Saturday during Mass; (d) the Vigil of Christmas.

2. During Requiem High Masses.

3. During the Blessing of Candles on the second of February.

It would likewise seem proper to remove flowers from the altar on the Vigil of Pentecost before the principal Mass and during a High Mass *de ea* on the Ember days of September.

From this it is clear that flowers are permitted on the altar even during Lent and Advent if the Mass or Office is not *de ea* (in violet color). Furthermore, during services such as Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, or devotions in honor of the Passion, or St. Joseph, or novenas, and the like, there would be no objection (in fact it would be desirable) to have the altar adorned with flowers.

ISADORE OBERHAUSER, C.PP.S.

Carthagena, Ohio.

THE SUNDAY EPISTLES AND GOSPELS.

ARTICLE II.

IN a paper contributed to the June 1925 number of this REVIEW, we discussed the appropriateness, or inappropriateness, of the present scheme of Gospels and Epistles (or Lessons) found in our missals. We mentioned some of the ideas by which such a selection might be guided, and by which —or some of which—the actual selection was, apparently, in its beginnings guided.

It became plain that the actual selection fails to correspond to any of those ideals. It was shown how, for our present generation, a thoroughly apt and practical scheme for the Sundays and greater feasts is peculiarly necessary, inasmuch as the masses of the people are, to a larger extent than ever before, out of touch with the weekday liturgy.

The present selection, besides being insufficiently helpful to the preacher, is defective and ill-balanced as a representation

of Holy Scripture. We had occasion to touch, though very slightly, upon the historical facts that have led up to the present state of the Sunday *pericopae*. In fine, we proposed or suggested three points of possible reform. These were: (1) orderly sequence from Sunday to Sunday; (2) regrettable omissions to be made good—at the cost, of course, of some elimination; (3) securing of harmony between Epistles and Gospels.

Leaving aside the first point as, seemingly, of less practical moment, we then dwelt on the consideration of the second and third.

Since we thus wrote, our belief in the utility of a reform, and in its possibility, has been in various ways confirmed. We have further noted how modern devotional expositors of the liturgy, while anxious, naturally, to display all its elements and details in the best light of appropriateness and congruity, are nevertheless quite unable to find these qualities in the succession and combinations of the Sunday Epistles and Gospels. In illustration, one may refer to the excellent manuals published by Dom Leduc, O.S.B., and Dom Baudot, O.S.B., and by Dom Lefebvre, O.S.B. Indeed, the brief historical notes given in those two books make it easy to understand how it is that the *pericopae* list shows nearly everywhere incoherence and incongruity rather than harmony and appropriateness.

Many assurances of agreement with our views have reached us, and no expressions of disagreement with either our premises or our conclusions. We therefore feel encouraged to return to the subject, and shall endeavor to offer in the present paper some more definite and positive proposals, prefacing them with two further remarks:

First, our suggestions are merely tentative, and designed to elicit fuller light from others.

Second, we shall not consider it necessary to repeat the general principles by which we are guided, and which we have already sufficiently indicated.

Beginning with the opening of the ecclesiastical year and the four Sundays of Advent, one may recall what is, for the liturgy and for preaching purposes, the general spirit of Advent. It is preparation for the coming of Christ—a coming

that is fourfold: that preached by John the Baptist; that witnessed by the shepherds in Bethlehem; that of the Last Judgment, and that of grace (especially the grace of repentance) in the individual human heart. To this scope the Sunday Gospels and Epistles of Advent respond undoubtedly; but, surely, in a very imperfect way. The most curious fact is the omission of the prophecies, especially those of Isaias. It is evident how appropriate to the season are page after page of the great Messianic prophet. This is, in fact, pointed out by liturgists, such as Dom Lefebvre.

Now, Isaias actually is made prominent in the liturgy of Advent—in the breviary, in the Quarter-Tense lessons, and in a few minor portions of the Sunday Masses. But in the Sunday Epistles there is nothing at all of his sixty-six chapters. All four of the Epistles are taken from St. Paul; and their appropriateness is largely of the kind that is extracted with difficulty, and by ingenuity.

It is not momentous, but it seems anomalous that, whereas St. Mark is traditionally "the lion" among the evangelists, because he commences with an announcement of the Great Precursor—"the voice crying in the wilderness"—yet no Sunday pericope presents to us St. John in the word of St. Mark.

The sequence of the four Advent Gospels and their combination with the Epistles, does not seem happy.

We therefore suggest the following as a not very revolutionary, but useful, scheme of reform.

First Sunday. To remain as it is.

Second Sunday. Instead of Romans 15:4-13, followed by Matthew 11:2-10; to substitute, Isaias 11:1-5 and 9—"egredietur virga de radice Jesse" (the present pericope, with a verse added, for Ember Friday); followed by Mark 1:1-11.

Third Sunday. Instead of Philippians 4:4-7, followed by John 1:19-28; to substitute Isaias 35: "Laetabitur deserta et invia" (the present pericope of Ember Saturday); followed by Luke 3:1-14 (the present pericope for the Fourth Sunday), with eight verses added.—These added verses give the interesting details of the Baptist's preaching to the crowds, the publicans and the soldiers—details which at present are given in no Sunday pericope.

Fourth Sunday. To put in as Gospel, John 1 : 19-28—chronologically more appropriate here than in its present place on the Third Sunday. Very appropriately would go with it, as Epistle, Philippians 3 : 7-15, on contempt of all things that we may follow Christ, to be substituted for the present Epistle, 1 Corinthians 4 : 1-5.

Leaving Advent, and passing on to the

Feast of the Circumcision, we may note that here a very short Gospel is preceded by a short Epistle, and that this Epistle is repeated from Christmas Day. Instead of this, (Titus 2 : 11-15) there might be profitably substituted, Ephesians 2 : 12-20, on Christ as our peace, mediator and corner-stone.

The Feast of the Holy Name. Here the Gospel is merely a repetition of the very short Gospel of the Circumcision. In its stead a very suitable place might be found here for John 16 : 23-30, on Praying to the Father in Christ's Name (at present the pericope for the Fifth Sunday after Easter).

First Sunday after Epiphany. (The Gospel of that Sunday tells of the Finding in the Temple). There might be substituted for the Epistle (Romans 12 : 1-5), which has here no appropriateness, Jeremias 7 : 3-7, on sincere honoring of the Temple, and of the God of the Temple.

Second and Third Sundays after Epiphany. The Gospels being left as they are, the Epistles might be strengthened. The present two Epistles are, Romans 12 : 6-16, and Romans 12 : 17-21. Add the six verses at present read on the First Sunday, and then divide thus: Verses 1 to 9, for the Second Sunday; verses 10 to 21, for the Third.

Fourth Sunday after Epiphany. Here both Epistle and Gospel seem disadvantageously brief; nor have they any discernible relation to each other.—By adding to the present Epistle (Romans 13 : 8-10) some of the preceding verses—1-7—a complete lesson on duties to superiors and equals would be gained. The Gospel, Matthew 8 : 23-27, relates only the Stilling of the Storm on the Lake. We should like to see it include verses 19-22, on vocation, and on leaving "the dead to bury their dead."

It will be found, we believe, that in the few cases where we suggest a lengthening of the present pericopae, the slight added length will fully repay itself in the value of the matter gained.

that is fourfold: that preached by John the Baptist; that witnessed by the shepherds in Bethlehem; that of the Last Judgment, and that of grace (especially the grace of repentance) in the individual human heart. To this scope the Sunday Gospels and Epistles of Advent respond undoubtedly; but, surely, in a very imperfect way. The most curious fact is the omission of the prophecies, especially those of Isaias. It is evident how appropriate to the season are page after page of the great Messianic prophet. This is, in fact, pointed out by liturgists, such as Dom Lefebvre.

Now, Isaias actually is made prominent in the liturgy of Advent—in the breviary, in the Quarter-Tense lessons, and in a few minor portions of the Sunday Masses. But in the Sunday Epistles there is nothing at all of his sixty-six chapters. All four of the Epistles are taken from St. Paul; and their appropriateness is largely of the kind that is extracted with difficulty, and by ingenuity.

It is not momentous, but it seems anomalous that, whereas St. Mark is traditionally "the lion" among the evangelists, because he commences with an announcement of the Great Precursor—"the voice crying in the wilderness"—yet no Sunday pericope presents to us St. John in the word of St. Mark.

The sequence of the four Advent Gospels and their combination with the Epistles, does not seem happy.

We therefore suggest the following as a not very revolutionary, but useful, scheme of reform.

First Sunday. To remain as it is.

Second Sunday. Instead of Romans 15:4-13, followed by Matthew 11:2-10; to substitute, Isaias 11:1-5 and 9—"egredietur virga de radice Jesse" (the present pericope, with a verse added, for Ember Friday); followed by Mark 1:1-11.

Third Sunday. Instead of Philippians 4:4-7, followed by John 1:19-28; to substitute Isaias 35: "Laetabitur deserta et invia" (the present pericope of Ember Saturday); followed by Luke 3:1-14 (the present pericope for the Fourth Sunday), with eight verses added.—These added verses give the interesting details of the Baptist's preaching to the crowds, the publicans and the soldiers—details which at present are given in no Sunday pericope.

Fourth Sunday. To put in as Gospel, John 1:19-28—chronologically more appropriate here than in its present place on the Third Sunday. Very appropriately would go with it, as Epistle, Philippians 3:7-15, on contempt of all things that we may follow Christ, to be substituted for the present Epistle, 1 Corinthians 4:1-5.

Leaving Advent, and passing on to the

Feast of the Circumcision, we may note that here a very short Gospel is preceded by a short Epistle, and that this Epistle is repeated from Christmas Day. Instead of this, (Titus 2:11-15) there might be profitably substituted, Ephesians 2:12-20, on Christ as our peace, mediator and corner-stone.

The Feast of the Holy Name. Here the Gospel is merely a repetition of the very short Gospel of the Circumcision. In its stead a very suitable place might be found here for John 16:23-30, on Praying to the Father in Christ's Name (at present the pericope for the Fifth Sunday after Easter).

First Sunday after Epiphany. (The Gospel of that Sunday tells of the Finding in the Temple). There might be substituted for the Epistle (Romans 12:1-5), which has here no appropriateness, Jeremias 7:3-7, on sincere honoring of the Temple, and of the God of the Temple.

Second and Third Sundays after Epiphany. The Gospels being left as they are, the Epistles might be strengthened. The present two Epistles are, Romans 12:6-16, and Romans 12:17-21. Add the six verses at present read on the First Sunday, and then divide thus: Verses 1 to 9, for the Second Sunday; verses 10 to 21, for the Third.

Fourth Sunday after Epiphany. Here both Epistle and Gospel seem disadvantageously brief; nor have they any discernible relation to each other.—By adding to the present Epistle (Romans 13:8-10) some of the preceding verses—1-7—a complete lesson on duties to superiors and equals would be gained. The Gospel, Matthew 8:23-27, relates only the Stilling of the Storm on the Lake. We should like to see it include verses 19-22, on vocation, and on leaving "the dead to bury their dead."

It will be found, we believe, that in the few cases where we suggest a lengthening of the present pericopae, the slight added length will fully repay itself in the value of the matter gained.

Sixth Sunday after Epiphany. We should like to see both the Epistle and Gospel altered. For 1 Thessalonians, 1:2-10 (St. Paul's praises of the Thessalonians), might appear Isaias 49:8-13, on God's deliverance of His people; and for Matthew 13:31-35 (the very brief parables of the mustard and the leaven), either Matthew 15:22-28 (the healing of the Syro-Phoenician woman), or Luke 6:17-23 (the "sermon on the plain", which at present is read on the eve of All Saints).

Sexagesima Sunday. Here we find the long Gospel of the Sower preceded by a very long and difficult Epistle—St. Paul's raptures, revelations and trials. For the Epistle we would substitute the prophecy of Jonas, Chapter 3:1-10, on the repentance and forgiveness of Niniveh, which at present is read on the Monday of Passion Week.

Quinquagesima Sunday. This day brings us Luke 18—our Lord's prophecy of the Passion, and the healing of the blind man. With this instructive pericope we should like to see associated (instead of the present Epistle, 1 Corinthians, 13, on the praises of charity), Hebrews 10:23, 26-31, on the danger and punishments of apostacy, with several practical warnings suitable to the season.

To the season! For we are now in the fore-courts of Lent. We have to recall what should be the special characteristics and topics of Lenten preaching—a matter on which St. Alphonsus Liguori and others have written valuable things, and which has been recently re-discussed by Fr. Rickaby, in his book, *The Ecclesiastical Year.* Guided by such authorities, we may safely pronounce that the *pericopae* list of the Sundays of Lent is susceptible of many improvements. It supplies to the preacher of "Repentance and Conversion" very little of the help that might be derived from the inspired pages. There is an almost complete absence of encouragement to repentant but weak and halting sinners. The prodigal son is not allowed to appear; nor the woman taken in adultery; nor the sinful woman at the pharisee's banquet; nor the Good Shepherd Himself. Was it, one might ask, simple chance, or some obscure rigorism that kept these, and other messages of love and mercy, out of the Lenten list of Sunday readings, and that put in some of the most obscure passages of the New Testament?—Well, it can hardly have been rigorism; for rigorism

would surely not have left out of its programme nearly all the more impressive Scripture passages dealing with the terrors of judgment and the punishments of sin. As a matter of fact, the most impressive topics of Christian "purgative" eloquence—the fate of the rich glutton; the folly of the man who planned new buildings instead of preparing for death; the last judgment; the narrow path and the narrow gate; the undying worm and unquenchable fire—are all absent from the Sunday *pericopae* between Quinquagesima and Easter.

It seems strange. But we can easily recall one explanation. Many of these excellent things find their places on the week-days of Lent, and therefore are missing from the Sundays. This simple explanation, however, cannot be felt as a practical justification.

It is clearly worth our while to pray and work that all these useful passages—these messages of comfort and hope, or of fear and warning—may at length be assigned to the prominent positions where alone they will be availed of, for the teaching and exhorting of the people.

G. O'NEILL, S.J.

Victoria, Australia.

THE VOW OF CHASTITY IN THE SUBDIACONATE.

SYNOPSIS.

INTRODUCTORY. The article is concerned with showing that the opinion denying the existence of a vow of chastity lacks probability.

I. The diriment impediment to Matrimony—the law of celibacy—the internal obligation to chastity. Misconception and misinterpretation of authors arise from confusing these ideas.

II. The existence of the vow proved—the sacrilegious nature of sins *de Sexto*—the vow taken for granted by ancient authors—Boniface VIII—the vow is implicit—the Code.

III. The external authority of authors cited against the vow largely due to misunderstanding—canonical reasons alleged—the Council of Trent.

ONE of the unfortunate and almost unavoidable consequences of the use of Probabilism has been to cast doubt on many obligations and doctrines which would otherwise be regarded as certain. The subject of the present article is a case in point. It is universally understood by the faithful that the clergy are under a vow of chastity, and by the clergy themselves this vow is understood to have been taken with the sub-

diaconate. No suspicion about the truth of this doctrine crosses the mind until we discover that the authors, who commonly and almost universally teach the doctrine as stated, find room for the opposite view and label it as "probable". Many of them limit the question to discussing whether the obligation to celibacy and perfect chastity arises *directly* from the vow, or merely from ecclesiastical law, apparently taking it for granted that the vow exists. But if the whole burden of the obligation is thrown on ecclesiastical law, it is quite an easy and obvious step to call in question the existence of the vow altogether, seeing that there is no explicit "form" of the vow in the ordination rite. Thus De Smet seems to hint that there may be no vow at all unless it is expressly taken before or during the ordination rite, and he interprets the decretal of Boniface VIII in this sense.[1]

Happily this rather singular view of a few authors is not sufficiently widespread to be of very great consequence, but it will be conceded at once that if it is even "probable" it is likely to create a great deal of doubt and obscurity which should never exist. Candidates for the subdiaconate would feel inclined to tamper with the solemn and ancient rite by introducing an "express" vow immediately before ordination, contrary to the principle "nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est". Doubts would arise in the minds of the clergy who had not adopted this rather irregular proceeding; for no matter how solemn and grave the obligation to chastity arising from ecclesiastical law may be, its binding force is considerably weakened if the subject is not bound by a vow. The trend of this article will be to outline the grounds on which the common and ancient doctrine rests, and to establish if possible the truth of Ballerini's teaching that the opposite doctrine lacks probability: "nulla solida ratio suffragetur" . . . "vanis ratiocinationibus Juristarum . . . concludi debet perperam eam opinionem appellari probabilem".[2]

I.

We may form the necessary background for a correct appreciation of the issue, by making a few necessary distinctions,

[1] De Matrim. § 573.
[2] *Opus Theol. Moral.*, Vol. IV, § 24.

and examining the points of doctrine concerning which no doubts can possibly be entertained. It is well known that the series of laws enforcing the celibacy of the clergy in the Western Church has been a gradual development, and it is quite beyond the scope of this discussion to trace their growth. It took the form of constituting Holy Orders a diriment impediment to the sacrament of Matrimony. Laws to this effect were made locally in Italy, Spain, and other places as early as the fifth century; but the first universal legislation of the kind appears to have been that of Canon 7 of the Second Lateran Council 1139.[3] The law of celibacy is therefore clearly of much earlier origin than the diriment impediment, and is considered by some to have operated in the earliest ages of the Church.[4] Both the law and the impediment attached to it are of ecclesiastical origin, for although any number of most valid and urgent reasons make it fitting that the clergy should be celibates, there is no reason intrinsic to the sacrament of Orders requiring that its recipient should not marry, still less is there anything intrinsic to the sacrament of Orders making it a diriment impediment to Matrimony. For the Church approves in Oriental Uniates a practice different from that of the West. This point is so simple and obvious that one would think it impossible that any misunderstanding should exist in regard to it. Yet many of the authorities who are commonly cited as giving support to the view that the priestly obligation to chastity does not arise from the vow, are as a matter of fact not discussing that question at all: they are stressing a sufficiently evident truth, namely that Holy Orders inhabilitate a cleric from marrying by ecclesiastical law. For even though no doubt had ever been thrown on the existence of a vow in the subdiaconate, the same truth would have to be admitted that the vow is made a diriment impediment of marriage by ecclesiastical law. A vow of chastity certainly renders the use of marriage illicit, but there is nothing intrinsic to the nature of a vow which would make the marriage contract invalid, apart from the intervention of positive law. Again a simple and obvious point: many authors cited in favor of the non-existence of a vow are as a matter of fact merely attacking the supposition that there is something in

[3] Cf. Canon 1072 and the previous legislation cited in the notes.

[4] Cf. Wernz-Vidal, II, § 102.

the *nature* of the vow itself which renders marriage invalid, and establishing the patent truth that the *inhability* arises from ecclesiastical law.[5]

If we turn now from the law of celibacy and the impediment of Orders, to the internal obligation of perfect chastity assumed with the subdiaconate, we shall get a step nearer to the real issue. For it is universally admitted, without any doubt or obscurity, that a cleric in Major Orders is not only unable to marry, but is so bound to chastity that the violation of this virtue, even by internal acts, is of a sacrilegious nature. It is the express teaching of the Code: "Clerici in maioribus ordinibus constituti a nuptiis arcentur et servandae castitatis obligatione ita tenentur, ut contra eamdem peccantes sacrilegii quoque rei sunt."[6]

How does this obligation arise? The common view, which we are about to discuss, assigns it to the vow of chastity required by the Church in the reception of the subdiaconate. For valid and urgent reasons the law of celibacy is imposed on the clergy; to secure this object more efficaciously the vow is imposed, and arising from the vow thus solemnly taken subsequent marriage is rendered invalid by ecclesiastical law; moreover, the diriment impediment exists even though the recipient through malice or ignorance expressly excludes the vow. "Ex dictis patet distinguendum esse inter principium unde oritur immediate obligatio servandae castitatis, et principium unde est nullitas matrimonii attentati a clerico in sacris. Illud (i. e. castitas) est votum, quae Ecclesia annexuit ordini sacro, hoc (i. e. nullitas) est ipsius Ecclesiae lex, quae ordinem sacrum voluit esse impedimentum dirimens et votum ei annexum solemnizavit ad dirimendum matrimonium postea contractum."[7]

II.

It is from the obligation to internal chastity which so binds the recipient of Holy Orders that its violation is of a sacrilegious nature, that the chief argument is drawn establishing the existence of a vow. The meaning and the importance of

[5] Cf. Ballerini, *Opus Theol. Moral.*, IV, § 19 and 21.

[6] Can. 132 and the legislation cited in the note.

[7] Ballerini, *Op. cit.*, § 26; cf. similar clear-cut distinctions in Prümmer, *Theol. Moral.*, III, 819; also Wernz-Vidal, V, § 284.

much of the positive legislation can be to some extent evaded and explained away, but this internal obligation cannot be evaded; it is contained in the Code and is universally admitted. If it does not arise from the vow of chastity, it is impossible to explain whence it does arise, and the difficulty is admitted by the exponents of the view which we are contesting (e. g. De Smet, *De Matrim.*, § 574). They are driven to explain the obligation by supposing some vague and intangible personal consecration connected with the character of Holy Orders causing sins against the virtue of chastity to carry the element of sacrilege. It is a supposition which is purely imaginary, and without foundation. For if this personal consecration is a necessary concomitant of Holy Orders, it should accompany the reception of the Sacrament in the Oriental Church; and if it existed with them, it is inconceivable that the Church should approve its violation among the Oriental Uniates. Moreover it is a principle generally admitted that the Church cannot command purely internal acts. It may be objected that the Church *does* command internal acts if a vow is attached to Holy Orders. Granted the Church cannot command its members to take a vow as such, but she can and does require vows as a necessary condition for entering a given state of life. For example, a person cannot enter the religious state without taking the vows, and the condition is a necessary one for the validity of the act; similarly a person cannot receive Major Orders in the clerical state without taking a vow of chastity, although the condition is not necessary for their valid reception.[8] If however the Church imposes the internal obligation of chastity in such a way that its violation is sacrilegious, and has done so nevertheless by some bond which is short of being a vow, it is for the exponents of this view to explain what exactly the bond is, and this none of them has yet succeeded in doing.

Whatever obscurity there may be about the matter is, I think, entirely due to the fact that the law of clerical celibacy was of very gradual growth. The Apostolic counsel of virginity and continence for those who would be solicitous for the things of the Lord, naturally and rightly applies in the first instance to

[8] Cf. *Summa*, 2-2, 88, 11, where this difference between the two vows is clearly shown.

the Christian Priesthood, which requires a degree of perfection even greater than that of the religious life.[9] From the earliest times the Church kept this ideal before the clergy and eventually enforced it by making Sacred Orders a diriment impediment, and by affixing to its reception a vow of chastity. It appears that at first an express promise or vow was required from the recipient, and Gregory the Great ordered this promise to be made by subdeacons: "Nullum facere subdiaconum praesumant Episcopi, nisi qui se victurum caste promiserit".[10] In a synod convened by Lanfranc at Winchester in 1075 an express vow of chastity was required from all future candidates for the diaconate and priesthood,[11] and the formula used is instructive: "N . . . promitto Deo omnibusque sanctis eius castitatem corporis mei secundum canonum decreta et *secundum ordinem mihi imponendum servare.* . . . "[12]

If one asks why it is that an express promise is no longer the custom in receiving the subdiaconate, the only answer is that it became so well and universally understood as implied in the rite, that the practice of expressly making a vow of chastity fell into disuse. This explanation is not an arbitrary one but is proved from the fact that authors simply take the existence of a vow for granted in many cases, and discuss it only to show how it differs from other vows, or in explaining the diriment impediment of Orders. Thus St. Thomas: "apud Latinos impedit ex vi ordinis et ulterius ex voto continentiae, quod est ordinibus sacris annexum; quod etiam quis verbotenus non emittat, ex hoc ipso tamen quod ordinem suscipit, secundum ritum occidentalis Ecclesiae intelligitur emisisse."[13] Suarez thence concludes it is quite certain that the Church intends and requires the recipients of the subdiaconate to make a vow of chastity, and if for any reason the recipient expressly excludes the vow, he is bound to make good the defect.[14]

Even in the famous text of Boniface VIII,[15] which all the authors quote in favor of the vow, its existence is taken for

[9] *Summa,* 2-2, 148, 8.

[10] C. I. D. XXVIII.

[11] Lingard, *History of England,* II, p. 42.

[12] Wernz-Vidal, V, § 282, n. 18, Suarez, *De Statu Religionis,* Lib. IX, c. xvii, cites other examples of similar enactments. Vives ed., Vol. XV, p. 788.

[13] Supplement, 53, 3; cf. also 2-2, 88, 11; 184, 6.

[14] Ibid. nn. 4 and 8.

[15] VIo Decret., lib. 3, tit. 15.

granted, and the law is concerned with determining the kind of vow which is diriment of marriage: "Nos igitur attendentes quod voti solemnitas ex sola constitutione ecclesiae est inventa, matrimonii vero vinculum ab ipso ecclesiae capite . . . illud solum votum debere dici solemne, quantum ad post contractum matrimonium dirimendum, quod solemnizatum fuerit per susceptionem sacri ordinis, aut per professionem expressam vel tacitam, factam alicui de religionibus per sedem apostolicam approbatis". From Proposition 72 of the Syllabus of Pius IX, the Church condemns the statement that Boniface VIII was the first to assert that the vow of chastity taken in Holy Orders is diriment of marriage.[16] Later legislation on various points connected with matrimony and vows similarly takes the view which we are defending for granted—e. g. Extravag. Joannis XXII, tit. vi: "licet votum solemnizatum per sacri susceptionem ordinis quantum ad impediendum matrimonium contrahendum, ac ad dirimendum, secundum statuta canonum sit efficax reputandum". Another example is found in the Constitution *Inter Preteritos* of Benedict XIV, which is dealing *ex professo* with matter arising out of the Jubilee faculties granted for the year 1750: "Ipsos (sc. Penitentiarios minores) potestatem dispensandi in Votis solemnibus Castitatis Paupertatis et Obedientiae in solemni religiosa professione, sive in Ordinis sacri susceptione emissis minime habere."[17]

Nor should the slightest suspicion adverse to the existence of a vow in the subdiaconate arise merely from the fact that it is made tacitly and implicitly. Lehmkuhl justly observes that the doubts which have arisen on the matter are due to forgetting the very simple and ancient distinction between express and tacit vows.[18] If doubts are to be admitted solely on this score, then why not call in question the vow of chastity in the rule of St. Benedict, the pattern and norm of the religious life? It contains only one express vow, that of *obedience* to the rule. and the other two are considered to be contained implicitly within it.[19] It was with the purpose of including the "tacit" vow that the Decretal of Boniface VIII, already quoted, reads:

[16] Denz., 1772.

[17] 3 Dec. 1749. *Bullarium,* edition 1846, Vol. III, p. 174.

[18] *Theol. Moralis,* II, § 619.

[19] Abbot Butler, *Benedictine Monachism,* Ch. ix, p. 123.

"aut per professionem expressam vel tacitam". Some have attempted to draw an argument from the fact that the Code makes no mention of "implicit" vows, but the most one can conclude from this silence is "a veteri jure non est recedendum",[20] especially as in this case the obligation of chastity, which we have seen can only arise from a vow if its violation is to be considered sacrilegious, is expressly confirmed in Can. 132 § 1.[21]

III.

If we now examine the arguments alleged against the vow, and the authors commonly cited for this view, we shall find that the arguments are for the most part negligible, and that some of the authors are wrongly cited through a misunderstanding. For many of them are not discussing this question at all, but merely determining that the diriment impediment is of ecclesiastical origin. Thus Scotus, who is cited by all the manualists, is concerned with showing that it is ecclesiastical law which renders the ordained person "illegitimus ad contrahendum"; he appears to take for granted that the vow exists, and certainly does not expressly deny its existence.[22] That many other ancient authors commonly alleged to support the modern views are quoted "per meram equivocationem", is ably proved by Ballerini.[23] These are the authors cited by St. Alphonsus (VI, 808) as giving probability to the view we are contesting, and at least one of them is misquoted.[24] Among the list of about a dozen authors quoted by De Smet against the vow is Ojetti. Here is another glaring example of this same misunderstanding. Ojetti's text reads "Haec *inhabilitas* repetenda est ex lege ecclesiastica, quae illam non tam voto, quam ipsi ordini sacro, videtur annectere." "Obligatio haec est de lege ecclesiastica quae clericis praecipit tum castitatem, tum modum eam profitendi, sc. ex voto."[25] This popular and well-known author clearly teaches the ancient and common

[20] Can. 6, n. 4.
[21] Wernz-Vidal, II, § 123 and V, § 284.
[22] IV Dist. 37. Roman Summary of Scotus, Vol. VI, p. 539, edition 1903.
[23] Op. cit., § 19, and 20.
[24] Cf. Note (a) Gaudé edition of St. Alphonsus.
[25] Ojetti, *Synopsis*, n. 2965, and n. 1232.

doctrine. Other modern authors cited by De Smet[26] are Scherer, Sägmüller, Leitner, Schulte, Schnitzer, Dujon, Gaumusch, Hilling, Vlaming, and Scharagl. I cannot say whether the same misunderstanding is responsible for their support to this theory. But, in any case, I think it must be admitted that the authority of these learned authors cannot be compared to the weight of external authority in favor of the more common opinion which we are defending.

Apart from any intrinsic arguments offered, one is forced to agree with Ballerini that the view we are contesting lacks even "external" probability in the accepted sense. It is true, St. Alphonsus calls it probable, although he does not himself adopt it, but the difficulty is not insurmountable, as his judgment is based on the authority of authors taken from the Salmanticenses, authors whom we have already seen to have been misinterpreted. The argument against this view drawn from the number and the authority of the authors is overwhelming: St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure, Bellarmine, Suarez, Vasquez, Benedict XIV, and in fact all the great classical authors.[27] Moreover, take any of the current and commonly used manuals such as Lehmkuhl[28] or Aertnys,[29] and it will be found that the common view is either taken for granted, or the doubt is mentioned only to be rejected.

The internal arguments put forward against the existence of a vow are based on purely canonical reasons. A solemn vow has the effect of dissolving a non-consummated marriage: the subdiaconate has not; a person could receive the subdiaconate validly even though he expressly refused to take the vow, and in spite of the omission would still be bound to celibacy; there is no certain and express law ordering subdeacons to take the vow and the Codex is silent on the point; the Council of Trent, Sess. XXIV, can. 9, draws a clear distinction between "clericos in sacris ordinibus constitutos" and "regulares castitatem solemniter professos"; the decretal of Boniface VIII is to be understood as teaching that, *if* a subdeacon took a vow of chastity in receiving the Order or immediately before (which

[26] Op. cit., § 574.
[27] References, Prümmer, III, § 819.
[28] Theol. Moral., II, § 619.
[29] II, § 727.

he was not bound to do by any general law), then that vow becomes solemnized by the reception of the Order.[30] The futility of all these reasons becomes apparent by bearing in mind the distinctions already referred to.

1. The law constituting Orders a diriment impediment (Can. 1072) must not be confused with the law requiring the observance of chastity in clerics and determining its violations as sacrilegious (Can. 132 § 1).

2. The nature and existence of a vow must not be confused with its canonical effects, which are many and various. Thus, generally speaking, only the solemn vow is diriment of marriage; but the simple vow in the Society of Jesus has this effect. A solemn vow in a religious Order dissolves a non-consummated marriage, but the solemn vow in the subdiaconate does not have this effect.

3. In taking a vow the subject may utter his promise in express words, or he may do so tacitly by undertaking an obligation or state of life to which a vow has been attached. The Decretal of Boniface VIII directly mentions this "tacit" kind of vow as operating even in religious profession. The present discipline of the Church no longer tolerates tacit religious profession, but requires it to be "express".[31] No private authority can extend this regulation so as to make it abolish the implicit vow in the subdiaconate.[32]

The Canon of the Council of Trent reads: "Si quis dixerit, clericos in sacris ordinibus constitutos vel regulares castitatem solemniter professos posse matrimonium contrahere, contractumque validum esse non obstante lege ecclesiastica vel voto . . . A. S." The non-existence of the vow is alleged to be deduced from this canon by applying "lege ecclesiastica" to *clericos* and "voto" to *regulares*. It is however abundantly clear from the acts of the Council that the present discussion was not in the minds of the Fathers in framing this canon. They were concerned with asserting the diriment impediment of vow and order, and in the phrase "non obstante lege ecclesiastica vel voto" condemned the doctrine of Luther. Moreover, even the solemn vow in an Order is a diriment impediment

[30] Cf. De Smet, § 573.
[31] Can. 572, § 1, n. 5.
[32] Wernz-Vidal, V, § 284, n. 49.

only by ecclesiastical law.[33] If one asks whether, as a matter of theory, the diriment impediment arises "mediante voto" or simply "ordine recepto", the simplest solution seems to be that it arises in both ways. Even though the vow is maliciously or ignorantly excluded the impediment is incurred "ceteris paribus",[34] and on the other hand that the impediment arises from the vow is evident from Boniface VIII. The point is really of quite secondary importance. But if having elected to sustain the view that the impediment arises from the reception of Orders, by ecclesiastical law, one proceeds to question the existence of the vow altogether, the deduction is false, and if this persuasion become at all widespread it would cut away one of the chief safeguards to sacerdotal chastity. For the great motive which strengthens a priest in resisting temptation is the consciousness of his vow, and the memory of the day when, young, generous, and enthusiastic, he solemnly promised the chastity of his body to God.

E. J. MAHONEY

St. Edmund's College, Ware, England.

THE ARCHBISHOP'S POCKET-BOOK.

III. FATHER MARTIN IS MADE VICAR-GENERAL.

SOON after the diocese had been raised to archiepiscopal rank, His Grace had gone to Ireland in answer to an urgent appeal from his only surviving sister who was at the point of death. His visit *ad limina* was not quite due at the time, or he would have taken the occasion to go to Rome. Now, however, at the end of two years, he found it necessary to make his diocesan report to the Holy See.

At this juncture he was deprived of the assistance of Monsignor Edmonds, his Vicar-General, on whose capable aid he had relied in preparing the account of his administration for the Holy See. The nomination of his vicar as bishop of a newly-created diocese in the western part of the States left the Archbishop in a temporary plight and doubt as to whether he could absent himself from his charge. He had, of course,

[33] Theiner, *Acta Genuina*, II, p. 463; Wernz-Vidal, loc. cit., n. 49; De Smet, § 573, n. 2.

[34] Cf. Can. 214, § 1.

known that the appointment was imminent, but there seemed a likelihood that it would not take effect until after his return from the visit *ad limina,* where he might confer about the matter with the Vatican authorities. Meanwhile he had to think of securing a future successor to Monsignor Edmonds as his vicar from among the older local clergy.

The unexpected departure of the newly-consecrated bishop for his field of labor made the immediate journey to Rome apparently impossible. What added to the awkwardness of the situation was the illness of the Archbishop's secretary, who ordinarily accompanied him on his visits abroad. Since the new vicar would require the presence of someone able to familiarize him with his responsibilities in the temporary absence of the Ordinary, the latter had found himself obliged to alter his plans. While formulating the appointment to the vicarship and the simultaneous call of the synodal examination for the parish which would in consequence become vacant, it suddenly occurred to him that Father Martin, the efficient chaplain of St. Catherine's, would make an admirable vicar-general. Not only was the retiring chaplain well versed in canon law and the traditions of the diocese, but, ever since the removal of the capable and genial curate from the cathedral, the Archbishop had regretted that he had ever allowed the change to take place. There were many occasions when he felt the need of intimate counsel, apart from his friendly association with the former assistant. The leading men in the cathedral parish, too, intimated that they had lost an eminently practical adviser who, though he had managed to efface himself from public view while resident in the parish, kept the management of the different societies definitely in hand.

The Archbishop invited Father Martin to an audience, in which he stated his purpose of promoting the chaplain to the vicarship.

"You have had a three years' vacation in those pleasant preserves of St. Catherine's," he said. "The care which the nuns have given you has had visible results, for you have become more handsome and portly than ever. You look like a sturdy captain who can weather the storms which the management of the archdiocese implies. I know you are familiar with the details of our administration, from your previous exper-

ience as occasional substitute of the archdiocesan chancellor and the secretarial work it involves. I have made Father Lambert chancellor. You and he have worked together formerly, when he was secretary, and—"

"But, Your Grace—"

"Hear me out. I cannot, except with great inconvenience, and incident embarrassment, postpone the visit *ad limina* which is due, and for which I had made all arrangements when Monsignor Edmonds unexpectedly left us for his new charge, because a sudden change made his presence there a necessity. You are the only person at present to whom I could entrust the administration of the archdiocese, and you have all the qualifications for the tasks involved. Any affairs with which you feel it impossible to deal you can defer until my return. Now this is definite. I am absolutely helpless in the matter, and there is no alternative. If, after my return from Rome, you desire another vacation, I shall let you go back to St. Catherine's; but for the present we need you here. I have partly arranged to send a priest to the convent who will take your place as soon as you can join us here. Your quarters at the cathedral are ready for occupancy."

"But Your Grace, what will the senior clergy say to all this? I am absolutely—"

"Make no objections, please, because I have your canonical obedience in my hands, and the schedule will not be altered. If you practise the humility which you preach, as I understand, so attractively in your conferences to the nuns, I shall be grateful for your aid in relieving me of a difficult position.—And now, Father Martin, be good-natured, and enter on your new office with the old cordial grace which I have hoped for."

There was nothing more to be said on the subject of the appointment.

"Shall I announce the change to the Reverend Mother at St. Catherine's?"

"Yes, if you will. I shall write to the superior that I have been obliged to make the appointment, for important reasons. There is a Benedictine Father here from England who, I understand, is free and willing to supply the chaplaincy for the present. He assures me that his superiors will make no objection. I have written to ask the abbot to leave the Father here

until I can select the proper man for his place. The nuns will be pacified by getting a holy religious for their chapel services. I would suggest that you remove only your library and personal belongings, so as to cause no inconvenience to the *locum tenens,* who has, of course, no furniture of his own."

IV. Father Martin Makes a Friend of Tom Burns.

The personnel at the cathedral, excepting the vicar, had not changed during Father Martin's absence. Only the junior curate was comparatively new to him, although they had met occasionally at the round-table talks in the convent chaplain's rooms, when the cathedral clergy had their rendezvous with Father Martin.

Tom, while he knew the new vicar by sight from his former residence at the cathedral, regarded him at first with some suspicion. The fact that Father Martin had been chaplain to the nuns did not greatly impress him. But when he saw how the Archbishop deferred to the newcomer, and how the household, from the clerk in the office to the old sexton, welcomed him, he changed his opinion.

His Grace had finally set the date of his journey to Rome, and it became evident that Tom was not to accompany him, but that Father Cyril, the Archbishop's secretary who had been with him on his trip to Ireland, would attend to the prelate's personal affairs. Young Burns felt somewhat disappointed and superfluous. Father Martin seemed to realize the situation. He had already taken a liking to the Irishman (who was not aware of the fact), seeing that he was clever, gifted with a certain native humor, and deferential—in short, an agreeable and trustworthy servant who had the advantage of not being too familiar with the traditions of the regular American menial. As a result, Tom attached himself to the new vicar-general as the most important personage after the Archbishop and, in the absence of the latter, as the man to whom he aspired to act as valet. He not only served Father Martin with a certain preference when there was need of the customary attendance at table, or in the hall, but made it a point to be in his way for confidential messages, arranging the books in proper sizes on the shelves and providing comfort in various ways about the house. In addition, he was invariably

on hand in the sacristy to serve the vicar's early Mass when the altar boys were missing. Briefly, he made himself useful, and often necessary in sundry ways, without appearing to obtrude his services.

V. A New Sexton for the Cathedral.

The Archbishop did not delay long in Rome. On his return he found things in comparatively good order, and promptly concluded that Father Martin made an excellent administrator, as he had hoped and foreseen he would.

The one thing that priests objected to in the new vicar-general was that he did not attend clerical funerals and receptions, as his predecessor had done. The Archbishop spoke to him about it, but without much effect. Father Martin maintained that he lacked the social qualities demanded for such meetings; that there were always clerical men of leisure to grace the occasions, and that, in short, he was a worker and not built for ornamental uses. His time could be much more profitably employed for the common good than by keeping the brethren in pleasant humor, filling vacant chairs at public functions or by eating late dinners and listening to clerical shop-talk. The platitudes about brotherly sociability were overdone, he thought; and one could show sympathy in many other more practical ways.

But he attended to all the business matters with promptness and the thoughtfulness demanded in the interest of religion and the diocese. In time His Grace came to depend entirely on his judgment and fidelity.

Meanwhile, Tom's importance also had grown immensely in the estimation of the clergy who came to the cathedral, and no less in that of the Archbishop. They saw that the vicar and his valet worked together like a clock, the vicar being the spring and Tom being the indicator. The priests and the servants of the cathedral had their daily course marked out for them, and everything moved quietly. If people wanted to know anything about the Archbishop's engagements or intentions, they would apply to Tom Burns. No matter how distinguished the visitors that called at the cathedral residence, they would have to pass muster before Tom, who would weigh the importance of their errand, and accordingly call for the

secretary, or the vicar, or in the last resort for His Grace himself.

There was one drawback to the smooth and clock-like regularity of matters moving in the archiepiscopal household. It came from the new sexton. He was a youngish man, who had been at one time in the seminary. After a somewhat shiftless career, which included his becoming a lay-brother for some weeks, he had been recommended by his former pastor as an honest, industrious, and pious young man whom he had employed about the church and who, he believed, would make an excellent sexton if he got a sufficient salary for his support, which his pastor could not give him. As the cathedral sexton actually in service at the time, was superannuated, and had meant, for some time past, to retire, the position was given to the new applicant.

Father Martin did not like the ex-cleric from the outset. One reason was that the very first morning after the installation of the new official in the sacristy a trifling accident ruffled the temper of the vicar. He, having finished his Mass, missed his spectacles, which he had taken off and placed beside him on the bench during his thanksgiving, for it was a hot day and the perspiration was apt to cloud the glasses. The sexton, coming in just then to put things in order, had picked up the stray glasses and with needless officiousness had placed them in the box that held the vicar's amice. After that he had gone off to attend to some business elsewhere. When Father Martin looked for the glasses that were indeed very necessary to his physical progress, they could not be found. In his search he stumbled over all sorts of things which should have been out of his way, until at length young Burns came to the rescue and discovered the missing lenses.

The accident would hardly have made a permanently adverse impression on the vicar had not the Irish valet also taken a definite dislike to the newcomer. His reason was a psychological problem, which was solved to his satisfaction in discussing the sexton with Father Martin.

"He has a windy head," said Tom, commenting on the placement of the stray glasses.

"What do you mean, and how do you know what he has in his head?" queried the vicar.

"Why, wind and warm air," insisted Burns. "He whistles in the morning, and he whistles at night; he whistles in the chapel and he whistles in the kitchen; and surely that shows an empty head with nothing but air in it. Ye never hear a man of sense piping the way he does, and the windpipe is out of tune most of the time, besides."

"You are too hard on him, Thomas. Give him time to grow accustomed to his new duties, and he will soon stop the whistling. The job is not an easy one, and demands serious attention which will soon sober him up."

"He never will be any good," insisted Tom. "Yesterday he talked with the scrub-woman and you could hear him all over the cathedral. I went across to the Sisters' house, to carry a message for His Grace, and when I came back the lad was still colloguing with the charwoman. He's no man for the place."

In conversation later with His Grace, Father Martin found that the Archbishop confirmed the valet's opinion. The former had noticed the noisy manner of the new sexton on the stairway where everyone was accustomed to observe a decorous silence, it being close to His Grace's library.

The outcome of these observations was the discharge of the sexton and the appointment of Tom Burns to the office, with a young man to act as his second, since Tom would be wanted in other capacities. There was ample work for both, however, and the new incumbent was to give added importance to the situation while taking upon himself the direction of things and the training of his junior, who felt his own inferiority.

There was more, however, in this promotion from valet to sexton which invested Tom's presence with a fresh dignity. In one sense he had been a sort of master of ceremonies to the Archbishop, who was a princely priest in his ways and naturally communicated something of his dignified bearing to his servant. Moreover Tom had learned the lesson of standing on his dignity from the English butler under whom he had served for a time. Now he found his opportunity of adding the magisterial element to his position, as guardian of the archiepiscopal person and premises. His hitherto unpretentious uniform took on a sort of clerical look. He evidently felt his superiority, which—with the exception of Father Martin, who

quietly humored the pretensions of the new sacristan—made Tom a personage next to the Archbishop in importance. The situation was perfected when His Grace allowed Tom to appropriate and wear his slightly faded black coat and vest which had done service for some years and were getting threadbare. The two dignitaries had much the same breadth of shoulders, and, with the aid of a little adaptation and brushing, the old coat of His Grace became a worthy adornment of the sexton's figure. Nor would Tom relinquish to anyone else the intimate control over the archiepiscopal wardrobe which he had exercised as valet. In short, he grew to be a factotum in the cathedral household, lording it over state and church alike.

VI. Keeper of the Pocket-Book.

Thus he came in time thoroughly to enjoy the confidence of his superiors, and to realize that he held a sacred trust, in which he was largely guided by Father Martin's wisdom and friendly counsel. His position was unique. While he idolized the Archbishop, his oracle was the vicar-general. But next to these two eminent personages came Tom Burns, the mainstay of both. His Grace was getting old. Nevertheless he showed no sign of willingness to give up the control of the diocese. He relied on his vicar, and on Tom Burns the sexton. The important medium over which Tom's care eventually extended, in all its various uses, was His Grace's pocket-book. In its daily mission, it weighted the archiepiscopal coat. The divesting, whenever His Grace after his official journey reached home, brought with it the moral duty of examining and safeguarding the wallet. In this the vicar naturally took the consulting part; for the morocco-leather case contained as a rule not simply such money as was left after the day's disbursements, but various documents and notes to be entrusted to the responsibility of the Archbishop's chief executive in diocesan administration.

The value of these contents varied with the nature and importance of the prelate's daily round of activity. For His Grace was not only a very busy man, but one who kept a scrupulous account of his transactions and engagements. Besides his banknotes of unequal size, and the details of expenditures in the form of bills and receipts, there were jottings of casual

engagements made on occasion of his visitations. These had to be coördinated with the official calls upon the Archbishop's time. It was also His Grace's habit to make a note of impressions which he received in the course of his visits to churches, and on Confirmation tours, or even in casual meetings of priests and laymen with whom he had dealings of more or less importance. These notes, which he carefully kept for the purpose of reference, often directed his official appointments. They suggested motives, as well as judgments, and gave those who happened to read them an insight into the impressions that swayed the Archbishop's opinions of men and things. His keen insight and a wide experience had caused him to formulate rules and maxims to which he held fast, with a tenacity that grew with the years.

To Father Martin these records were open secrets which he was meant to act upon as they came to his knowledge. There were complete trust and understanding between vicar and superior. Both had but one mind and one heart in the affairs of diocesan administration. If Father Martin had at any time his own opinions about things or about persons with whom he had to deal as the Archbishop's representative, he frankly stated them, and, while a temporary difference led to occasional skirmishes in their discussion of diocesan affairs, the intercourse was always friendly and, on the part of the vicar-general, in the end thoroughly loyal and submissive.

It is readily seen then what an important feature the pocket-book played in the management of ecclesiastical affairs. At the beginning of each day a list of the engagements to which His Grace had to attend, by previous appointment or the demands of business and convention, was placed upon the prelate's writing-desk. After looking it over, he would put the page with the pertinent documents in his leather case, secured by a stout rubber band.

On the return to the house the pocket-book was taken out and examined. The list of engagements was checked off, the documents were laid in a place apart, for registry or further study, and the empty wallet was left on the table for the next day's use. In the interval, none but the vicar and Tom Burns ventured to enter His Grace's private apartments.

While Father Martin, as the Archbishop's *alter ego,* attended to the important matter of noting down the obligations involved in administering Confirmation, conducting ceremonies of dedication, the blessing of bells, altars, churches, and the like, Tom saw to it that the notes were in their proper place in the Archbishop's coat pocket. The valet's intelligence grew with his rise in position as cathedral sexton; and daily familiarity with details of canonical administration soon gave him a proper sense of the value of things in the archiepiscopal pocket-book.

It thus happened that Tom Burns, in his combined role of confidential valet of the Archbishop and sacristan of the cathedral, became the keeper of his superior's private and official business affairs, so far as they were represented by the contents of the Archbishop's pocket-book. These contents included, as stated before, all kinds of secular as well as religious documents and memoranda. Thus the valet learned to know not only the dates of episcopal engagements and of administration, such as the canonical visitation of parishes, Confirmation, investiture of nuns in the holy habit of religion, commencement exercises, and similar occasions of ecclesiastical importance, but also the various interests exhibited by His Grace in scientific as well as charitable community enterprises. For the Archbishop was public-spirited, and kept his finger on the pulse of the social, the educational and even the political body, of which he was an honored member of acknowledged superior judgment and influence.

But the most interesting part, to Tom, of the old leather pocket-book consisted of certain notes *not* particularly intended for his shrewd observation. These dealt with the Archbishop's relations to his clergy, and bore occasional headlines such as "Censure," "Suspension," "Dismissal," together with names of persons, dates, etc. Since it was Tom's habit to meet most persons, including members of the clergy, who came to see His Grace, these notes were not without their use in regulating his manner and policy with callers at the cathedral residence.

[*To be continued.*]

THE SACRED AND THE SECULAR IN ORGANIZED CHARITY.

WHEN we make our morning offering, we include "our prayers, works, and sufferings". Our daily work, offered to God, is meritorious. Our offering gives it spiritual value. We fuse into one the secular and the sacred.

Father Plater, S.J., gives a striking illustration of the interrelation of the two realms. The history of the introduction of machinery into England, he tells us, "is a story of horrors," because there were no Catholic forces to guide it—because "Catholic theology had been banished from the land".

Cardinal Manning in his book, *The Four Great Evils of the Day* (pp. 122-123), speaks of the effects of the introduction of Christianity on what are often termed "mere material problems". Slavery was extinguished; woman was raised to her true dignity; wars were restrained by laws of mercy and by arbitrations of justice; criminal laws were mitigated and tempered; human sympathy of man for man was established. These effects Christianity accomplished because "The Son of God is the Head of all power in heaven and on earth, both of the spiritual and of the political or civil order of the world". Manning goes on to say, "Civilization, or the culture or ripening of the civil and political society of men, is never perfect, and can never be perfect, unless elevated by union with the laws of Christianity under the sovereignty of God".

Interest in the world's economic and social conditions is, for the Christian, necessarily associated with zeal for spiritual welfare. When Frederick Ozanam founded the great social service organization known as the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, he was moved thereto less by the sight of poverty than by the sight of infidelity. He aimed to attract men to Christ and His Church by presenting to them charity in action.

"It is the opinion of some," says Pope Leo XIII in his Encyclical *Graves de Communi,* "that the social question, as they call it, is merely 'economic'. The precise opposite is the truth, that it is first of all, moral and religious, and for that reason its solution is to be expected mainly from the moral law, and the pronouncements of religion." Again, in his *Rerum Novarum,* he declares: "We approach the subject with confidence, and in the exercise of the rights which manifestly

appertain to us; for no practical solution of the question will be found apart from the intervention of religion and the Church."

Leo wrote with historical justification. T. W. Allies, writing of the fourth and fifth centuries, says that the Christian religion then "*embraced the whole man* with a plenitude of power, which the indifference and division of our times hardly allow us to conceive;" and he cites, in confirmation, St. Basil, St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, and St. Leo. In the Middle Ages, popes, councils, universities, monasteries, and theologians took the lead in solving the economic and social questions then arising. If we look for Scriptural basis for this attitude of churchmen, we find evidence aplenty. In *The Social Value of the Gospel,* Garriguet shows conclusively that the Gospel offers abundant light and invaluable guidance in social relations. In preaching the Gospel, St. Paul dealt directly and constructively with the economic order of his time. For example, he insisted on the universal obligation of work;[1] he upheld the dignity of manual labor then regarded as humiliating;[2] he laid down the rights and duties of ownership;[3] he promulgated rules regulating the relations of masters and servants.[4]

St. Paul made no fundamental distinction between works that are called secular and works that are purely spiritual.[5] All things rightly taken have a spiritual significance. His ideal was: "Therefore, whether you eat or drink, or whatsoever else you do, do all to the glory of God";[6] "All whatsoever you do in word or in work, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ";[7] "I do all things for the Gospel's sake".[8]

The Reformation had, as one of its fruits, the divorcing of religion from secular works. The guilds of pre-Reformation days passed away and with them the spirit that animated them. The partnership spirit, the fraternal charity, the coöperation

[1] Thess. 3:6-12.
[2] I. Cor. 9:7-10.
[3] Eph. 4:28; I. Thess. 4:6.
[4] I. Tim. 6:1-5.
[5] See Calippe, *Saint Paul.*
[6] I. Cor. 10:31.
[7] Coloss. 3:17.
[8] I. Cor. 9:23.

of all in civic and community life, were very largely destroyed. Private profit and selfish gain replaced common welfare as the motive in industry. Civilization ceased to be a harmonized whole and was cut up into isolated and antagonistic sections. Catholics of the sixteenth and subsequent centuries undoubtedly became more or less impregnated with the spirit of the times.

During the Middle Ages a religious atmosphere pervaded society, and especially home life. Children acquired a knowledge of Christian doctrine as naturally as they learned their mother-tongue. The danger in this condition was that priests and parents were likely to assume that no special effort is required to teach Christian doctrine. This seems to have been the case, for when the Schism of the West weakened the sense of Christian brotherhood, the effort to restore it in the minds of the faithful was not nearly so great as was the effort to restore unity in the government of the Church. A knowledge of the work of the Holy Ghost in the Church and devotion to Him noticeably declined, so that the ground was prepared by the fifteenth century for un-Christian views of life.

Catholics in English-speaking countries have been much slower to move again toward the Catholic ideal than their fellows on the continent of Europe. Some indications of our backwardness in North America in this regard are as follows:

1. A belief, still wide-spread, that the Church's work is confined to the sanctuary; that the administration of the Sacraments, the teaching of Catechism and preaching, constitute the priest's sole concern.

2. The lack of active participation by Catholic laymen in public welfare movements and their want of interest in civic and community life. Our Catholic weeklies foster this mentality in assuming, by their silence, that there is nothing sacred about the performance of the duties of citizenship.

3. The almost exclusive prevalence of personal advancement and gain, among educated Catholics, as motives for success in their trade or profession; and a consequent feebleness of the influence of Catholic principles in the world's busy places.

There are signs of reaction.

1. The establishment in some seminaries of courses in social action.

2. The world-wide movement, concurred in by many bishops, priests, and laymen in America, to have a feast established in honor of Christ, the Universal King of Society.

3. The growing popularity of national and international organizations of Catholics, formed for the purpose of bringing Catholic principles to bear on public, social and international relations.

"A man cannot cut himself in two", says Garriguet in *The Social Value of the Gospel.* "He alone is a true Christian who does not imprison his Faith in the secrecy of his conscience, but makes it the mainspring of his actions, both as a citizen and as an individual."

Goyau in *Autour du Catholicisme Social,* thus pointedly addresses opponents of this view: "May the oligarchy which would like to bury religion in the past, and the numerous Catholics who, with extreme caution, wish to imprison it in the individual soul, understand that we are called, as Christians and as citizens of the twentieth century, to spread Christianity throughout the society of our day, and to impregnate with it the tissue of our social relations." And he further declares that the Catholicism which holds itself aloof from social and economic life is "a Catholicism bearing the stamp and date of a period silenced by secularism".

Professor Herron, whom Garriguet quotes, is equally severe. "No kind of atheism," he says, "is so productive of terrible consequences, so insulting to God, so anarchical in its intent, as the attempt to raise a barrier between Christian life and the domain of earthly affairs."

The truth is that the Christian doctrine of brotherhood involves obligations of unselfishness, of mutual interest in and help of one another, whether in the realm of the spiritual or in the realm of material things. While among works there is undoubtedly a gradation of sacredness, nevertheless all things are God's and as St. Augustine says, commenting on the greatest commandment of the Law: "Whatever may suggest itself to us as an object worthy of love is to be borne into the same channel in which the whole current of our affection flows. . . . The channel of the love of God . . . suffers no stream to be drawn off from itself, by whose diversion its own volume would be diminished".[9]

[9] *Christian Doctrine Enchiridion,* Vol. 9, p. 19.

In human society there are two orders of persons and things. There is the spiritual order and there is the secular order. Each has its own aims, its own organizations, its own government, its own laws, its own policies. But the actions and activities of individuals cannot be thus classified in separate compartments of life. Practically all our actions and activities affect, and many belong to, both orders in different relations or from different points of view. The command to practise charity is, in the first place, a command to sanctify the ordinary work of daily life. Much the greater part of it is coöperation with others—it may be in business, or in the performance of professional or official duties, or working for others at so much per day. All coöperation, which is mutually beneficial and is animated by the love of God, is Charity.

JOHN R. MACDONALD

Georgeville, N. S., Canada.

Analecta.

ACTA PII PP. XI.

Motu Proprio.

DE PONTIFICIA COMMISSIONE SACRAE ARCHAEOLOGIAE DEQUE NOVO PONTIFICIO INSTITUTO ARCHAEOLOGIAE CHRISTIANAE.

I primitivi cemeteri di Roma cristiana con le cripte e le tombe dei Papi e dei Martiri e i santuarî eretti su quei gloriosi sepolcri, le basiliche fiorite entro le mura dell'Urbe nell'età della pace, con i loro grandiosi musaici, serie innumerevole delle iscrizioni, le pitture e le sculture, la suppellettile cemeteriale e liturgica, costituiscono per la santa Chiesa Romana un sacro patrimonio di pregio e di importanza senza pari. Sono, invero, codesti, testimoni altrettanto venerandi che autentici della fede e della vita religiosa dell'antichità ed insieme fonti di primissimo ordine per lo studio delle istituzioni e della cultura cristiana, fin dai tempi più prossimi agli apostolici.

Perciò, se i Romani Pontefici riguardarono sempre come loro stretto dovere la tutela e la custodia di tutto questo sacro patrimonio, negli ultimi tempi intensificarono le loro sollecitudini segnatamente per quella che, a buon diritto, se ne stima la parte più preziosa, cioè i cemeteri sotterranei, comunemente appellati *Catacombe*.

Dotati di uno speciale carattere di religione e di santità, derivante dagli insegnamenti e precetti della cristiana, in-

violabilimente tutelati dalle stesse leggi civili dell'Impero, i cemeteri nei secoli delle persecuzioni furono retti e governati dalla Chiesa, e dai Papi affidati per l'amministrazione ai preti ai diaconi, riconoscendosi dai Cesari pagani la proprietà di quelli, non nei singoli fedeli, ma nella Chiesa medesima, rappresentata dal Vescovo; dominio proclamato poi, nell'avvento della pace cristiana, e riconosciuto solennemente ai Romani Pontefici, come ogni altro ecclesiastico possesso, da Costantino il Grande e dai suoi successori.

Quando, dopo il tempestoso succedersi delle invasioni barbariche, i Papi si videro costretti a spogliare le necropoli suburbane dei più cari tesori, trasferendo all'ombra sicura delle basiliche intramurane le reliquie dei loro predecessori e Martiri, non per questo abbandonarono la cura di quei luoghi venerati, ma per molto tempo ancora si adoperarono a restaurarli e a mantenerne aperti gli accessi alla pietà dei fedeli. Ed il culto per i sacri cemeteri nella Chiesa Romana non si estinse neppur quando, causa le tristi vicende di tempi calamitosissimi, gli aditi ne rimasero quasi tutti ostruiti; poichè anche allora i fedeli continuarono a discendere nelle pochissime cripte accessibili, per pregare dinanzi ai vuoti sepolcri, nei quali avevano riposato le spoglie degli eroi della Fede.

Per le pazienti indagini di dotti e ardenti investigatori di sacre antichità, a partire dal secolo XVI, ritrovati poi in grandissimo numero gli accesi ai suburbani cemeteri, i Nostri predecessori promulgarono editti e leggi per la tutela di quei sacri recessi e dei diritti assoluti della Chiesa su codesto suo sacrosanto retaggio; ed anche si ebbero, per ogni tempo ed occasione, le provvide disposizioni dei Cardinali Vicarii di quest'Alma Città; venendosi a formare così, riguardo a tali monumenti, un'ampia, speciale e importantissima legislazione.

Mosso da esempî sì illustri, e all'intento di secondare il risorgente fervore di studi più severi delle cristiane antichità, suscitato per merito del p. Giuseppe Marchi, della Compagnia di Gesù, e più ancora di Giovanni Battista De Rossi—che doveva poi a ragione essere onorato del titolo di Principe degli archeologi cristiani—, il Sommo Pontefice Pio IX Nostro predecessore di v. m. istituî, fin dal 6 gennaio 1852, una speciale *Commissione di Archeologia Sacra,* dando ad essa le facoltà necessarie per la più efficace tutela e sorveglianza dei cemeteri

e degli antichi edifici cristiani di Roma e del suburbano, per la sistematica e scientifica escavazione ed esplorazione degli stessi cemeteri, e per la conservazione e custodia di quanto dagli scavi e dai lavori si venisse ritrovando o si fosse riportato alla luce.

A questo scopo, appunto, contemporaneamente alle prime grandi escavazione e alle meravigliose scoperte nella Roma sotterranea cristiana, dal De Rossi genialmente intuite e preparate, si fondava il Museo Cristiano Pio nel Palazzo Apostolico del Laterano,—la cui istituzione fu espressamente richiesta dalla stessa *Commissione* quale uno dei caposaldi per cimentarsi alla grandiosa opera che dal Pontefice le era stata affidata—, e colà trovarono degna sede tanti preziosi monumenti per l'innanzi dispersi e nascosti.

Nei primi mesi del nostro Pontificato, poichè ricorreva il settantesimo anniversario dalla istituzione della *Commissione* ed il centesimo dalla nascita del De Rossi, vero rinnovatore della scienza archeologica cristiana, volemmo riunire presso di Noi la *Commissione,* che ha per capo e presidente il sig. Cardinale Nostro Vicario generale, e Ci interessammo del suo andamento, del progresso dei lavori e dei bisogni ai quali occorresse provvedere, perchè la *Commissione* non sia, ai nostri giorni, impari al còmpito che deve disimpegnare.

Ci piacque ricordare allora l'attività esplicata dalla *Commissione* fin dal suo inizio per le varie sue attribuzioni, e quanto essa abbia bene meritato della stessa Chiesa Romana, che dalle scoperte dei suoi cemeteri antichissimi e dei santuari dei Martiri, ha riacquistato parte notevolissima del suo più antico patrimonio, ha visto ricomporsi intere pagine della sua storia e venire alla luce documenti e monumenti del più alto valore storico per dimostrare l'antichità dei suoi dogmi, della sua fede, delle sue venerande tradizioni.

Benchè molti di tali monumenti siano eloquenti di per sè, è d'uopo riconoscere, che gli studî condotti con più severa e profonda critica dai grandi archeologi cristiani dell'epoca recente—primo fra tutti il non mai abbastanza lodato Giovanni Battista De Rossi—condussero, non soltanto a ritrovare nella Roma sotterranea cristiana quello che nel secolo XVI aveva imperfettamente, ma con intuito di fede, divinato con pochi altri l'infaticabile investigatore delle sacre romane antichità

Antonio Bosio, ma ad identificare, sulla scorta degli itinerarî del Medio Evo, cemeteri, cripte storiche e sepolcri di Martiri, a interpretare sapientemente le pitture e le sculture alla luce degli scritti dei Padri della Chiesa e del vicendevole confronto. Così, le primitive tombe dei Martiri e dei molti Nostri gloriosi predecessori rivivono e tornano ad essere nuovamente mèta di culto devoto e di ammirazione profonda; e i fedeli di ogni gente e di ogni lingua, sulle pareti dei sacri ipogei, nei dipinti, nei graffiti, nelle sculture, nelle iscrizioni della più remota antichità leggono oggi, con intensa commozione, non pochi di quegli articoli della Fede cattolica, apostolica, romana, che più acremente furono oppugnati dai novatori.

Non è, quindi, chi non veda quanto sia necessario, importante, e per Noi doveroso, sostenere, con opportune ed efficaci provvidenze, l'opera della Nostra *Commissione,* affinchè i vetusti monumenti della Chiesa siano conservati nel miglior modo allo studio dei dotti, non meno che alla venerazione e alla ardente pietà dei fedeli di ogni paese, che nei trascorsi quindici lustri sovvennero generosamente i Romani Pontefici nella grandiosa, dispendiosissima intrapresa del ritrovamento e della escavazione delle romane Catacombe.

Che se delicata e piena di responsabilità è la cura di custodire e conservare i monumenti già ritrovati, tra le speciali difficoltà dei luoghi, ben più difficile e gravosa si presenta l'opera di proseguire le esplorazioni della Roma sotterranea cristiana, per mettere in luce tante altre necropoli, ancora affatto, o solo in minima parte, esplorate, e per compiere l'escavazione dei più celebri cemeteri, anche oggi sono noti soltanto in alcune loro regioni, mentre ne rimangono molte altre sepolte sotto il terreno e fra le rovine. E questo còmpito arduo è reso nel momento attuale più impellente e delicato dal fatto, che attorno a Roma l'espansione edilizia omai si è estesa anche a lontane zone, ricche di cemeteri insigni, i quali perciò sono esposti a danni gravissimi e forse ad irreparabile rovina.

Noi, pertanto, confermando quanto disposero i Nostri predecessori e segnatamente Pio IX e Leone XIII, di v. m., circa la *Commissione* e le sue mansioni riguardo ai cemeteri o Catacombe, alle basiliche e agli antichi sacri edificî di Roma, nei quali nulla è da innovare, nulla da modificare senza sua intesa e beneplacito, abbiamo stimato utile e opportuno ampliare e

rafforzare la *Commissione* stessa con l'attiva partecipazione di altri competenti, che, corrispondendo da varie regioni e nazioni, le apportino contributo prezioso di studî e moltiplichino i mezzi, perchè essa possa attuare efficacemente, in misura sempre più larga, le finalità per cui fu istituita.

Alla *Commissione,* che a buon diritto e con vera compiacenza chiamiamo Nostra, perchè a lei e alle sue cure è affidata tanta parte del preziosissimo primitivo patrimonio della Chiesa nostra, e perchè in conservarlo, tutelarlo, accrescerlo, essa agisce per autorità del Romano Pontefice, riconosciamo al pari dei Nostri predecessori, e riconfermiamo il diritto esclusivo e collettivo per la conservazione degli antichi sacri monumenti, per la esplorazione ed escavazione dei cemeteri sotterranei e delle aree sepolcrali all'aperto cielo; per la determinazione e direzione assoluta di qualunque lavoro debba o voglia in quelli praticarsi, o che possa avere attinenza con essi, e per la prima pubblicazione dei risultati di scavi o lavori. Essa soltanto, come viene precisato nell'apposita *Regolamento* da Noi pure approvato, può stabilire le norme e le condizioni con cui rendere accessibili e visibili al pubblico e agli studiosi i sacri cemeteri, sotto la responsabilità di Custodi che essa nomina e riconosce e che da essa per questo debbono dipendere, e deve indicare quali cripte, e con quali cautele, siano da adibire per la santa liturgia.

Alla Nostra *Commissione,* quindi, che, sola investita dell'autorità di compiere escavazioni e lavori nelle Catacombe e nelle aree cemeteriali, di fatto li compie diligentemente a mezzo del proprio ufficio tecnico, e che in Nostro nome deve amministrare quanto riguarda i sacri cemeteri, anche sottostanti o uniti a basiliche o ad altri sacri edifici governati o immediatamente dipendenti da speciali giurisdizioni è pur giusto e naturale, che esclusivamente convergano le oblazioni che vogliono destinarsi a tale scopo e che occorrono ogni anno in misura sempre più larga.

Per questo, malgrado le gravi ristrettezze economiche nelle quali Ci troviamo, tra le molte e svariate necessità, alle quali riteniamo còmpito del Nostro Apostolico ministero sovvenire in ogni parte della terra, Noi abbiamo creduto di annoverare anche la previdenza per le romane Catacombe e abbiamo pur voluto contribuirvi personalmente, secondo le Nostre forze.

Poichè è senza dubbio ottima cosa, in mezzo a tanta preoccupazione per interessi materiali, a tanto oscuramento di nobili idee, a tanta guerra incessante, che si pretende muovere alla nostra Religione santissima con le armi della critica storica, dare esca per riaccendere nei cuori la fiamma della Fede e della primitiva storia e poesia cristiana, con la luce che irradia dai mistici recessi delle Catacombe del suolo romano e li molte altre regioni della cristianità.

Per questo occorre anche dare allo studio della sacra Archeologia incoraggiamenti ed aiuti nuovi, adeguati all'importanza della disciplina, ai risultati che si sono raggiunti e a quelli non minori che dobbiamo ancora attendere; ad a ciò vogliamo rivolgere in modo particolare le Nostre cure e le Nostre previdenze.

E poichè accanto alla *Pontificia Commissione,* e più antica di essa, fiorisce la *Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia* tanto benemerita e tanto favorevolmente nota agli studiosi per le sue dotte pubblicazioni, abbiamo deliberato di coordinare le due istituzioni e di aggiungervi un *Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana,* con proprio regolamento da Noi visto ed approvato, per indirizzare giovani volonterosi, di ogni paese e nazione, agli studî ed alle ricerche scientifiche sopra i monumenti delle antichità cristiane. Le tre istituzioni riunite in apposita sede, che all'uopo sarà tosto apprestata, e debitamente armonizzate, potranno agevolmente completarsi e coadiuvarsi nel fine commune di così alta importanza; e gli studiosi di sacra Archeologia potranno più largamente approfittare dell'immenso materiale che Roma offre e dei mezzi che la Commissione, l'Accademia, l'Istituto, per le proprie relazioni scientifiche internazionali, saranno in grado di ampiamente loro somministrare.

Il ricordo e la visione del lavoro compiuto fino ad oggi dalla *Pontificia Commissione* Ci dà animo a bene sperare per l'avvenire, perchè, nonostante le difficoltà dei tempi e delle circostanze, l'opera deve essere intensificata ed allargata con orizzonti ognora più vasti. E Ci arride l'idea, che una intesa più intima venga a stabilirsi tra coloro, che nelle diverse regioni d'Italia e nelle diverse parti del mondo attendono di proposito a studî e ricerche di sacra Archeologia; e che Roma, continuando la gloriosa tradizione del grande De Rossi,

divenga il centro di nuovi e più fecondi studi archeologici sacri. Ciò, senza dubbio, arrecherà notevolissimo vantaggio alla scienza, non meno che alla storia viva della santa Fede nostra.

La *Pontificia Commissione,* sostenuta dalla *Pont. Accademia* e dall'*Istituto,* nel portare periodicamente a pubblica conoscenza, con l'apposita *Rivista,* i risultati degli scavi, e nell'illustrare i cemeteri e i monumenti della *Roma sotterranea,* corrispondendo con i vari centri di cultura archeologica, potrà con maggior lena e più largo aiuto attuare le nobili finalità che i Romani Pontefici ebbero di mira nell'istituirla e nel sostenerla. E col lavoro intensificato e coordinato non apparirà più irraggiungibile (Ci è caro sperarlo) l'ideale di una descrizione dell'*Orbis antiquus Christianus* intravveduto dai valenti archeologi che diedero vita e inizio alla *Commissione* Nostra, e che, con le ricerche pazienti e le scoperte meravigliose nella Roma sotterranea cristiana, prepararono il materiale, stabilirono i certi canoni, che furono potuti con successo applicare da alti in varie anche lontane regioni, e particolarmente nella nobilissima Africa Romana, per ridare alla Chiesa cattolica e alla scienza molte altre rarissime gemme.

Confidiamo, che nella magnifica e onerosa impresa Ci assista, da ogni parte del mondo cattolico, l'aiuto e la collaborazione efficace di quanti possono emulare i generosi oblatori, i quali nei passati settanta anni hanno reso possibile alla Chiesa Romana il recupero di tanta parte del suo antico e sacrosanto patrimonia nascosto nei recessi della Roma sotterranea.

Ai santi Martiri, in questo anno giubilare, affidiamo la realizzazione dei Nostri voti e il più largo successo delle attività della Pontificia Nostra *Commissione.* A loro intercessione imploriamo dal Signore la benedizione sulla *Commissione* stessa, sull'*Accademia,* sull'*Istituto* e su quanti si adoperano e si adopreranno a loro vantaggio; su coloro che zelano e sostengono il culto dei Martiri nei sacri cemeteri, sugli amici tutti delle Catacombe romane.

Dato dal Nostro Palazzo Apostolico al Vaticano nel giorno natalizio di s. Damaso Papa, 11 dicembre di quest'anno giubilare 1925, del Pontificato Nostro anno quarto.

PIO PP. XI

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE RELIGIOSIS.

DECLARATIO CIRCA NATURAM IURIDICAM CONGREGATIONIS SORORUM A MISERICORDIA (SISTERS OF MERCY).

Sacrae Congregationi Religiosorum Sodalium negotiis praepositae sequentia dubia, pro opportuna solutione, subiecta fuere:

I. An Congregatio Sororum a Misericordia, vulgo *Sisters of Mercy,* quae, iuxta earum Constitutiones, adprobatas sub die 6 iunii 1841 a Gregorio XVI per tramitem Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, singulas domos separatas habent sub respectiva Episcopi iurisdictione atque auctoritate, censenda sit religio iuris pontificii vel iuris tantum dioecesani.

Et, quatenus affirmative ad primam partem et negative ad secundam:

II. An sint similiter iuris pontificii etiam plures illae Congregationes Sororum a Misericordia, quarum diversae domus variis in locis, cum adprobatione Sanctae Sedis, sub uno gubernio centrali coaluerint.

Porro Sacra Congregatio, in congressu diei 7 novembris 1925, re mature perpensa, respondendum censuit prout respondet:

Ad I. *Affirmative* ad primam partem, *negative* ad secundam.

Ad II. *Affirmative.*

Facta autem de praemissis relatione Ssmo Domino Nostro Pio divina Providentia Papae XI, in audientia habita ab Emo Card. Praefecto huius Sacrae Congregationis, die 24 novembris 1925, Sanctitas Sua resolutionem eiusdem Sacrae Congregationis approbavit et confirmavit ac publici iuris fieri mandavit.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria Sacrae Congregationis de Religiosis, die, mense et anno ut supra.

C. CARD. LAURENTI, *Praefectus.*

L. ✠ S.

Vicentius La Puma, *Secretarius.*

S. CONGREGATIO RITUUM.

I. DUBIA.

Maximilianus Crespo, Archiepiscopus Popayanensis, a Sacra Rituum Congregatione sequentium dubiorum solutionem reverenter expostulavit; nimirum:

I. Summus Pontifex Pius X sa. me., die 18 maii 1907, indulgentias christifidelibus concessit qui devote sacram Hostiam adspexerint cum in Missae sacrificio elevatur, additis in ipsa oculorum elevatione verbis "Dominus meus et Deus meus!" Hinc quaeritur:

1. An fideles Missae adstantes, in sacrae Hostiae elevatione, clara et elata voce verba "Dominus meus et Deus meus!" proferre possint? An etiam ad Calicis elevationem?

2. An ipse celebrans idem agere valeat, submissa tamen voce?

II. Ex Decreto Sacrae Rituum Congregationis, diei 29 aprilis 1922, Missae sanctorum duodecim Apostolorum habent Evangelia stricte propria. Cum vero Sanctus Paulus inter duodecim Apostolos non recenseatur sed, ut ait Sanctus Beda Venerabilis, sit tertius decimus Apostolus, quaeritur:

An Evangelia quae leguntur in Missis de festis Conversionis et Commemorationis S. Pauli Apostoli, diebus 25 ianuarii et 30 iunii, sint stricte propria?

III. Si accidat ut aliquod festum duplex maius vel minus aut semiduplex a festo duplici primae classis impeditum commemoretur tantum ad Laudes, debetne omitti ad Matutinum nona Lectio historica vel stricte propria de festo impedito?

IV. Sacerdos Feria quarta Cinerum Missam lectam celebraturus in oratoriis semi-publicis, potestne ante Missam benedicere cineres sine cantu eosque omnibus petentibus distribuere?

V. Ex canone 1100 Codicis iuris canonici, extra casum necessitatis, in Matrimonii celebratione servandi sunt ritus in libris ritualibus ab Ecclesia probatis praescripti aut laudabilibus consuetudinibus receptis. Hinc quaeritur:

1. An in his regionibus Manuale Toletanum, quod passim in celebrando Matrimonio atque in administratione Ssmi Viatici et Extremae Unctionis adhibetur, sit praeceptivum?

2. Et, in casu affirmativo, an Ordinarii locorum eius usui semel pro semper renuntiare valeant, ut eius loco Rituale Romanum dehinc ab omnibus adhibeatur?

VI. Attenta declaratione Sacrae Poenitentiariae Apostolicae (Sectio de Indulgentiis), diei 21 iulii 1919, inspectis etiam Decretis Sacrae Rituum Congregationis, diei 15 octobris 1920 et 10 novembris 1921, de ratione cantandi Litanias Lauretanas, quaeritur:

An in Litaniarum recitatione absque cantu iterari liceat priores invocationes hoc modo: *V. Kyrie, eleison. R. Kyrie, eleison.—V. Christe, eleison. R. Christe, eleison.—V. Kyrie, eleison. R. Kyrie, eleison?*

VII. Sorores cuiusdam Instituti, er perantiqua consuetudine, quoties aliqua Soror e vita decedit, huius defunctae cadaver in lignea capsa, *albo* panno undequaque obvoluta, vel *albo* colore ex omni parte picta, in signum virginitatis, recondunt; quae capsa postea, pro Officio et Missa defunctorum, in medio oratorio Communitatis deponitur, sed undique variis *albi* coloris ornamentis circumsepta. Hinc quaeritur:

An talis perantiqua consuetudo tolerari possit?

VIII. Pluribus in locis, Deo favente, instituta est consociatio Sociarum Sacratissimi Cordis Iesu, quae in prima cuiuslibet mensis Feria sexta peculiaria pietatis exercitia in honorem Divini Cordis peragere et sacram Communionem recipere student; et tunc celebratur Missa votiva de Sacratissimo Corde Iesu iuxta Decretum generale Sacrae Rituum Congregationis, n. 3712, diei 28 iunii 1889. Cum vero huiusmodi Sociae, ruri praesertim, ab ecclesia paroeciali valde distent, et ob pauperem earum conditionem laboribus ad vitam sustentandam necessariis incumbere debeant, ac proinde sine gravi incommodo ecclesiam in Feria sexta adire nequeant, quaeritur:

An in hisce casibus Missa votiva de Sacratissimo Corde Iesu, a memorato Decreto indulta, in prima mensis Dominica celebrari possit, cauto tamen ut una saltem Missa dicatur de Officio diei?

Sacra autem Rituum Congregatio, audito specialis Commissionis voto, praepositis quaestionibus accurate perpensis, ita respondendum censuit:

Ad I. Quoad primam partem, *negative in omnibus,* ad mentem Caeremonialis Episcoporum, lib II, cap. VIII, n. 70, et Decreti generalis n. 3827, ad III, diei 22 maii 1894.

Quoad secundum partem, *negative,* iuxta canonem 818 Codicis iuris canonici et Rubricas Missalis Romani.

Ad II. *Negative.*

Ad III. *Affirmative.*

Ad IV. *Affirmative,* ex gratia, iuxta Memoriale Rituum, iussu Benedicti Papae XIII editum.

Ad V. Expedire ut adhibeatur Rituale Romanum, iuxta Decreta n. 3654, *Carthaginien.,* 16 februarii 1886, et n. 3792 ad IX, *Strigonien.,* 30 augusti 1892.

Ad VI. *Affirmative.*

Ad VII. Serventur Rubricae ac Decreta n. 3035 ad XI, *Briocen.,* 21 iulii 1855, et n. 4165 ad V, *Dubiorum,* 4 augusti 1905.

Ad VIII. *Negative.*

Atque ita rescripsit ac declaravit die 6 novembris 1925.

✠A. Card. VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,
S. R. C. Praefectus.

L. ✠ S.

Alexander Verde, *Secretarius.*

II. DUBIA

DE RESPONSORIIS PRIMI NOCTURNI ET DE EVANGELIO DOMINICAE IN FINE MISSAE.

Sacrae Rituum Congregationi sequentia dubia pro opportuna solutione humillime proposita sunt; nimirum:

I. Quando resumuntur vel anticipantur Lectiones primi Nocturni de quavis Dominica impedita, debentne semper dici cum suis Responsoriis, etiamsi haec in Dominicis seu Feriis praecedentibus recitata fuerint?

II. In fine Missae de Festo duplici I vel II classis cum Commemoratione de occurrente Dominica debetne recitari Evangelium eiusdem Dominicae, quamvis Missa Dominicae infra hebdomadam resumatur?

III. In fine Missae de Officio diei cum Commemoratione de Missa Dominicae primo infra hebdomadam resumpta debetne omitti Evangelium eiusdem Dominicae?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, audito specialis Commissionis suffragio, propositis dubiis respondendum censuit:

Ad I. *Affirmative,* iuxta novas Rubricas generales Breviarii Romani, tit. I, n. 4; nisi anticipentur Lectiones primi Nocturni

de Dominica quinta Octobris, quae dicuntur cum Responsoriis de Feria currenti, iuxta specialem Rubricam.

Ad II et III. *Affirmative,* iuxta novas Rubricas generales Missalis Romani, tit. IX, nn. 1 et 2.

Atque ita rescripsit ac declaravit, die 11 decembris 1925.

✠ A. Card. Vico, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,
S. R. C. Praefectus.

L. * S.

Alexander Verde, *Secretarius.*

III. Dubium

de forma paramentorum

A Sacra Rituum Congregatione nuper expostulatum est: "An in conficiendis et adhibendis paramentis pro Missae sacrificio sacrisque functionibus liceat recedere ab usu in Ecclesia recepto, aliumque modum et formam etiam antiquam inducere?"

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, audito specialis Commissionis suffragio, omnibus perpensis, respondendum censuit: "Recedere non licere inconsulta Apostolica Sede; iuxta Decretum seu Litteras circulares Sacrae Rituum Congregationis ad Rmos Ordinarios datas sub die 21 augusti 1863".[1]

Atque ita, Summo Pontifice Pio XI approbante, rescripsit, declaravit et servari iussit, die 9 decembris 1925.

✠ A. Card. Vico, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,
S. R. C. Praefectus.

L. * S.

Alexander Verde, *Secretarius.*

Rme Domine uti Frater,

Quum, renunciantibus nonnullis Rmis Episcopis aliisque Ecclesiasticis et Laicis viris, Sanctam Sedem non lateret quasdam in Anglia, Galliis, Germania et Belgio Dioceses immutasse formam sacrarum vestium, quae in celebratione Sacrosancti Missae Sacrificii adhibentur easque ad stylum quem dicunt gothicum elegantiori quidem opere conformasse; Sacra Con-

[1] *En harum litterarum exemplum.*

gregatio legitimis pro tuendis Ritibus praeposita super huiusmodi mutatione accuratum examen instituere haud praetermisit.

Ex hoc porro examine, quamvis eadem Sacra Congregatio probe nosceret sacras illas vestes stylus gothicum praeseferentes praecipue saeculis XIII, XIV et XV obtinuisse, aeque tamen animadverti Ecclesiam Romanam aliasque latini ritus per orbem Ecclesias, Sede Apostolica minime reclamante, a saeculo XVI, nempe ab ipsa propemodum Concilii Tridentini aetate, usque ad nostra haec tempora illarum reliquisse usum; simulque, eadem perdurante disciplina necnon Sancta Sede inconsulta, nihil innovari posse censuit, ut pluries Summi Pontifices in suis edocuere Constitutionibus, sapienter monentes mutationes istas, utpote probato Ecclesiae mori contrarias, saepe perturbationes producere posse, et fidelium animos in admirationem inducere. Sed quoniam Sacrorum Rituum Congregatio arbitratur alicuius ponderis esse posse rationes, quae praesentem immutationem persuaserunt, hinc, audito Sanctissimi Domini Nostri Pii Papae IX oraculo, verbis amantissimis invitare censuit Amplitudinem Tuam, ut, quatenus in Tua Dioecesi huiusmodi immutationes locum habuerint, rationes ipsas exponere velis, quae illis causam dederunt.

Interim Amplitudini Tuae fausta omnia a Domino adprecor.

Amplitudinis Tuae

Romae die 21 augusti 1863.

Uti Frater

C. Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae CARD. PATRIZI, *Praefectus.*

D. Bartolini, *Secretarius.*

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE DISCIPLINA SACRAMENTORUM.

ULTRAIECTEN.

DE PATRINIS BAPTISMATIS

24 iulii 1925

Die 8 octobris 1924 Revmus Archiepiscopus Ultraiecten. preces, quae sequuntur, huic Sacrae Congregationi porrexit:

Beatissime Pater,—Archiepiscopus Ultraiectensis, ad pedes Sanctitatis Vestrae provolutus, humiliter petit solutionem dubiorum quae exponuntur:

Ex can. 765, 5° C. I. C. ut quis sit baptismi patrinus, oportet baptizandum in actu baptismi per se vel per procuratorem physice teneat aut tangat, vel statim levet, seu suscipiat de sacro fonte, aut de manibus baptizantis; et ex can. 768 patrinus cum baptizato contrahit spiritualem cognationem, quae quidem ex can. 1089 matrimonium irritat. Iam vero, uti apud nos moris est, qui patrinum agere vult, nemini mandatum confert expressum, sed, nisi per se officio illo perfungatur patrinus, baptizans vel baptizandi parentes aliam personam invitant, ut pro patrino absente agat.

Hinc sequentia dubia solvenda proponuntur:

I. *an ex tali agendi modo patrinus absens contrahat cognationem spiritualem, et inde exoriatur impedimentum canonis 1079; et si negative:*

II. *quidnam a patrino faciendum sit ut agere valeat per procuratorem; nimirum:*

(*a*) *an debeat conferre determinatae personae mandatum speciale;*

(*b*) *an vero sufficiat, ut edat, sive scripto sive voce, mandatum generale pro persona per parentes vel per baptizantem determinanda; immo*

(*c*) *an sufficiat mandatum generale praesumptum pro quavis persona.*

Hisce dubiis Emi Patres in plenario Conventu diei 24 iulii 1925 responderunt:

"Ad I. Si patrinus, agnoscens huiusmodi consuetudinem, eidem sese conformare intendat, et aliunde patrinus ipse esse possit ad normam can. 765, *Affirmative*".

"Ad II. provisum in I. Attamen praedicta consuetudo est reprobanda: 1° quia indubitanter constare debet patrinum in facie Ecclesiae proprium munus suscepisse, quod per dictam consuetudinem manet incertum et aequivocum; 2° quia patrinus suum munus suscipere debet cum plena notitia et conscientia inde exorientis obligationis ad mentem can. 769, quod excludere videtur praefata consuetudo, quippe quae redigit patrini officium ad quemdam inanem ritum; 3° quia ex tali recepto more facultas fere demitur parocho conditiones explorandi, quae a can. 765 et 766 requiruntur, ut quis valide et licite patrini munus suscipiat".

"Hisce prae oculis habitis, Instructio pro Rmis Ordinariis locorum fiat".

Facta insuper de his omnibus relatione Ssmo Domino Nostro Pio Papae XI per infrascriptum Secretarium huius Sacrae Congregationis, die 29 iulii 1925, Ssmus decisionem EE. Patrum ratam habuit et confirmavit.

✠A. Capotosti, Ep. Thermen., *Secretarius.*

SACRA POENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA.

Dubium circa Coronas ex Vitro confectas.

Sacrae Poenitentiariae Apostolicae sequens dubium pro opportuna solutione exhibitum fuit:

Sacra Congregatio Indulgentiarum, die 29 februarii 1820, ad 2, expresse declaravit, Coronas Indulgentiis ditari posse etsi ex vitro seu chrystallo confectas, *dummodo globuli sint ex vitro solido atque compacto.*

At in Monito n. 1, praeposito authentico elencho Indulgentiarum Apostolicarum, edito die 17 februarii 1922, ita legitur: "Res aptae ad recipiendam benedictionem pro Indulgentiis Apostolicis lucrandis, sunt tantummodo Coronae, Rosaria, Cruces, Crucifixi, parvae Statuae, Numismata, dummodo non sint ex stanno, plumbo, vitro aliave simili materia, quae facile confringi vel consumi possit". Hinc quaeritur:

Num id, quod in allato Monito ita in genere et simpliciter statuitur de Coronis, quae sunt ex vitro, intelligi debeat ad tramitem praedictae declarationis Sacrae Congregationis Indulgentiarum?

Et Sacra Poenitentiaria Apostolica, die 24 novembris 1925, respondit: *Affirmative.*

Facta autem de praemissis relatione Ssmo D. N. Pio divina Providentia Papae XI, ab infrascripto Cardinali Poenitentiario Maiore, in Audientia diei 18 decembris 1925, idem Ssmus Dominus responsum Sacrae Poenitentiariae benigne approbavit atque publici iuris fieri iussit.

Datum Romae, ex Sacra Poenitentiaria Apostolica, die 21 decembris 1925.

Fr. Andreas Card. Frühwirth, *Poenit. Maior.*

L. ✠ S.

S. Fagiolo, *S. P. Secretarius.*

DIARIUM CURIAE ROMANAE.

PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS.

9 July, 1925: Monsignor Zephyrin H. Marois, of the Archdiocese of Regina, Canada, Protonotary Apostolic *ad instar participantium.*

20 October: Monsignori Charles Proulx and Edward Trinquier, of the Diocese of Mont Laurier, Canada, Domestic Prelates of His Holiness.

4 November: Monsignori M. Alphonsus Desrochers, John F. Fagan, John F. Conlin, John T. Sheehan, and John Patrick Phelan, of the Diocese of Springfield, Domestic Prelates of His Holiness.

6 November: Monsignor Bernard S. Conaty, of the Diocese of Springfield, Protonotary Apostolic *ad instar participantium.*

7 November: Patrick Augustine Heney, of the Diocese of Seattle, Commander of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class.

7 November: Judge James B. Carrol and Dr. Michael J. Fallon, of the Diocese of Springfield, commanders of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class.

10 November: Monsignor Thomas J. Ernest Devoy, of the Diocese of Manchester, Domestic Prelate of His Holiness.

10 November: Monsignor Stephen Woznicki, of the Diocese of Detroit, Private Chamberlain (supernumerary) of His Holiness.

25 November: Monsignor Daniel A. Hanly, of the Diocese of Seattle, Protonotary Apostolic *ad instar participantium.*

25 November: Messrs. Algernon Bowring and Herman Cameron Norman, of the Archdiocese of Westminster, Private Chamberlains of Sword and Cape (supernumerary) of His Holiness.

28 November: Mr. Herman Tapke, of the Archdiocese of New York, Knight of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class.

30 November: Monsignors Theodore M. Ryan, William J. Noonan, James G. Stafford, Gustave Achtergael, and John Sweens, of the Diocese of Seattle, Domestic Prelates.

9 December: Monsignor Jeremiah S. Buckley, of the Diocese of Manchester, Protonotary Apostolic *ad instar participantium.*

9 December: Monsignors Hugh Cameron, of the Diocese of Argyle, Innocent Ryan and Gerard Cotter, of the Archdiocese of Cashel, Domestic Prelates of His Holiness.

19 December: Mr. Herbert Kelly, of the Diocese of Shrewsbury, Commander of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class.

15 January, 1926: Mr. William Joseph O'Reilly, of the Archdiocese of Armagh, Private Chamberlain of Sword and Cape, of His Holiness.

Studies and Conferences

Questions, the discussion of which is for the information of the general reader of the Department of Studies and Conferences, are answered in the order in which they reach us. The Editor cannot engage to reply to inquiries by private letter.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

MOTU PROPRIO of Pope Pius XI on the Pontifical Commission of Sacred Archeology and the new Pontifical Institute of Christian Archeology.

SACRED CONGREGATION OF RELIGIOUS issues a declaration on the juridical status of the Congregation of the Sisters of Mercy.

SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES answers several liturgical questions.

SACRED CONGREGATION ON THE DISCIPLINE OF THE SACRAMENTS solves some doubts about sponsors at baptism.

SACRED APOSTOLIC PENITENTIARY decides the question of attaching indulgences to rosary beads made of glass or crystal.

ROMAN CURIA announces officially some recent Pontifical appointments.

THE SACRIFICE OF CALVARY.

I.

WAS CHRIST'S SACRIFICE FINISHED ON CALVARY?

I say Christ's Sacrifice, for it is one. He came to take away sin by the sacrifice of Himself, or, as He Himself tells us, to give His life a ransom for many. It should seem, therefore, that when He died on Calvary His Sacrifice was finished; and so, in a certain sense, it was. So far as His Sacrifice consisted in His Passion and Death, it ended there. But that was His Sacrifice only in its physical aspect. Were it not for the voluntary and visible offering He made of Himself to God the Father in the Supper, the Passion and Death would not have been a sacrifice at all; it would have been simply Deicide.

The rite of our Lord's Sacrifice is plainly outlined in the Old Testament sin-offering, and especially in the great Sacrifice of Expiation on the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16). Once a year, on that day, the high-priest himself offered in sacrifice a goat and a calf for his own sins and the sins of the people. First, he solemnly consecrated and offered the victim in the place set apart for the sacrifice. Then, as he was offering as well for his own sins as for the sins of the people, he himself slew the victim, for this was the law of the sin-offering, that the victim should be slain by the sinner. Finally, taking of the blood of the victim, the price of sin, he first went with it into the holy of holies, and immediately after came out into the holy place and handed it over to God there.

Such was the rite of the Old Testament sin-offering as laid down by God Himself. In the light of it let us now consider our Lord's One Offering for the sins of the world. First of all, He solemnly consecrates and offers Himself to God the Father in the Supper. Next, He is slain by the sinners of the world, represented by the Jews and the Romans. Is His One Offering for sin now complete? We shall find the answer to the question in the answer to this other question: Was the sin-offering of the Old Testament complete when the victim was slain? It was not. The slaying of the victim was but the sinner's part in the sacrifice; there remained the handing over to God of the victim's blood in the holy place, which was the priest's part. The parallel is perfect, and no one can question it who does not substitute his own notion of sacrifice for that of Him who inspired the Scriptures.

The rite of the Sacrifice of Expiation reveals clearly how Christ's Sacrifice was to be completed. He is the High-Priest of the New Covenant. Therefore, to complete His Sacrifice, He had to go into the holy of holies in the heavenly places; He had to ascend into Heaven, and there offer the Price of our Ransom to the Father, the Wounds that bore testimony to His Passion and Death, the Life that He had laid down and taken up again. Nor was this all. For, as the high-priest of the Old Testament came back immediately out of the holy of holies to offer the sacrifice in the holy place according to the rite that was prescribed, so our High Priest, after He had made the ceremonial offering of His Sacrifice behind the veil, offered

it again in the earthly tabernacle by the ministry of His Apostles. "Yea Himself," says St. Ambrose, "is plainly seen to offer in us, since His word sanctifies the Sacrifice that is offered."[1] Thus is Christ's Sacrifice completed in Heaven and on earth; in Heaven by the offering behind the veil, on earth by the Clean Oblation upon our altars.

And this stands to reason. By sin we get into God's debt. We rob Him of the love, and obedience, and loyal service that are so justly His due. To pay a debt the first thing needful is to procure the means—the money to pay it with. But if you keep the money in your pocket, or in the house, you will never pay the debt. You've got to go to the man to whom you owe it and hand the money over to him. So Christ hands over to the Father the Price of our Ransom when He enters Heaven, and does so perennially on our altars by the hands of His priests. For, as we read in the Secret of the Mass of the Ninth Sunday after Pentecost, "As often as this commemorative Sacrifice is celebrated the work of our redemption is carried on."

We see, then, the literal exactness of the Secret Prayer *pro una defuncta*. "This Sacrifice," to wit, the Mass, "without which no one ever hath been free of sin." No one is ever free of sin till the price of the sin has been paid over to God in Heaven and on earth. Christ Himself does this in Heaven, where "He is ever living to make intercession for us." The priest who offers Mass does it on earth, or rather, Christ does it in and through him.

Luther and Calvin maintained that Christ's Sacrifice was finished on Calvary. Unfortunately, those who combated them, for the most part, granted this, and so were under the necessity of maintaining that there was a complete sacrifice in the Supper which was continued in the Mass. The Supper was thus separated from the Cross, and the Mass was made a different sacrifice from that of Calvary. Happily this severance of the Mass from the Cross has never got beyond the text books of theology. In our catechisms and simple manuals of instruction the age-long and universal tradition of the Church still finds expression. It is there openly declared that the Mass is one and the same sacrifice with that of the Cross. See Appendix *The Sacrifice of the Mass*, pp. 162-176.

[1] *Ennar. Ps. 38*, n. 25.

In the Sacrifice of our Redemption we have to distinguish carefully the Sinner's part from the Priest's part. That was the immolation, this the offering. The Sinner's part is done and over; the Priest's continues evermore. It is plain which was the part that formally constituted the Sacrifice and is pleasing to God. "I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hosts, and I will not receive a gift of your hand. For, from the rising of the sun, even to the going down, My Name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to My Name a Clean Oblation; for great is My Name among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of hosts"—Mal. 1:10, 11.

II.

The Sacrifice of Calvary Operative in the Mass.

At page 108 of *The Sacrifice of the Mass* by the present writer is to be found this paragraph:

"As a help to the reason I would call to mind a distinction of the Schoolmen. They speak of *actus primus* and *actus secundus,* meaning by the former 'the act of the essence', or the existence of a thing, by the latter its operation. And they lay down this principle: *Omne ens est propter suam operationem*—Every being is for its operation, i. e., it exists for doing something. Our Lord's Sacrifice of Himself attained its *actus primus,* or complete essence, on Calvary; it attains its *actus secundus,* or complete operation, on our altars. Or, to put this in another way, the Sacrifice of Calvary is operative in the Mass."

In saying Mass this morning, I was struck with the words we read in the Secret Prayer (*Sabbato post Cineres*):

> Suscipe, Domine, sacrificium cujus te voluisti dignanter immolatione placari: praesta, quaesumus; ut, hujus operatione mundati, beneplacitum tibi nostrae mentis offeramus affectum.
>
> Receive, O Lord, the sacrifice by the immolation of which it hath been Thy gracious will to be appeased; grant, we beseech Thee, that, being purified by the operation thereof, we may render Thee a pleasing homage.

There can be no question that the sacrifice here referred to is the Sacrifice of the Cross. If, then, this prayer expresses

the mind of the Church, the Sacrifice of the Cross is operative in the Mass, and the Mass is the *actus secundus*, or operation, of the Sacrifice which attained its *actus primus*, or complete essence, on Calvary.

Here is another Secret Prayer (*pro una defuncta*):

"By this Sacrifice, without which no one hath ever been free of sin, may the soul of Thy handmaid be freed from all her sins."

I have rendered "sacrificiis" of the text, a plural of excellence, by "Sacrifice", because it is plain that there is question of the Sacrifice that is here and now being offered, viz., the Mass. The conception embodied in this prayer, as in so many other prayers,[2] peremptorily excludes the contention of those who may say that the Sacrifice of Calvary is the Sacrifice of our Ransom, a "propitiation not for our sins only but for those of the whole world", and that there is need of another sacrifice to apply its merits. For this prayer distinctly affirms that the Mass is the Sacrifice "without which no one ever hath been free of sin", not Adam or Eve, or any of their children; that it is, therefore, itself the Sacrifice of our Ransom, which St. Augustine told us so long ago was offered up for the soul of his mother.

I say, then, once more: *Legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi.* Let us believe that Holy Church means what she says in the very act of offering her great Sacrifice. Let us have the humility to acknowledge that it is the Sacrifice of Calvary itself, and not another sacrifice, which is daily offered up on our altars, even if we cannot see how this can be so. The Mass is not the only "Mystery of Faith" that we are called upon to receive with the simplicity of little children on pain of being shut out from the Kingdom of Heaven.

ALEX MACDONALD,
Tit. Bp. of Hebron.

IS THE INVOCATION "REGINA PACIS" PERMANENT?

Qu. According to a decision of the S. Congregation of Extraordinary Affairs (ECCL. REVIEW, Vol. LIV, page 197), Ordinaries may sanction *during the war* the addition of the invocation "Queen

[2] See *The Sacrifice of the Mass*, p. 21.

of Peace, pray for us" immediately after the petition "Queen of the Most Holy Rosary, pray for us", in the Litany of Loreto.

Is it allowed to continue this practice? In view of Canon 934, § 2, of the new Code, "The indulgences are lost by any addition, subtraction, or interpolation of prayers". (C. S. Officii, 22 Junii, 1916; S. Poenitent., 21 Julii, 1919; *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* Vol. XII, p. 18.)

A friend maintains that the invocation "Regina pacis" has become a permanent addition to the Litany of Loreto, quoting a personal letter of Benedict XV to the Papal Secretary of State, which is written in Italian, and is recorded in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* Vol. IX, p. 266.

Is it not customary to use the official language of the Church rather than Italian when decisions pertaining to the whole Church are promulgated? What is really prescribed by this Epistola ad Petrum S. R. E. Card. Gasparri? And if the invocation is made a permanent addition to the Litany, is this information to come from the bishop of each diocese?

This is a question of either gaining or forfeiting the indulgences of the Litany of Loreto. Please give your valuable opinion.

Resp. The fact that the invocation "Regina Pacis: ora pro nobis" has become part of the Litaniae Lauretanae, and is to be added in the recitation for gaining the traditional indulgence, is attested by the recently revised (typical) edition of the Roman Ritual, approved by the S. C. R., 10 June, 1925. (Cf. the new *Rituale Romanum,* ed. Fr. Pustet, p. 329, and Mame-Benziger Brothers, p. 383.)

THE LAW OF FAST ON TITULAR FEASTS.

Qu. I beg to submit a question to the REVIEW for decision, and I believe that the question and its decision will prove interesting to many of your readers. It is well known to all your readers that the saintly Pontiff, Pius X, granted the privilege of eating meat on Friday whenever any one of the six holidays of obligation falls on Friday. Now my question is: Did he not also extend that very same privilege to the people of any parish whenever the patronal feast of that parish falls on Friday, provided of course that the patronal feast day is observed "solemniter" in that parish? I am pretty certain that he did, but I cannot find any reference to it in the old numbers of the REVIEW of those years. I think that the REVIEW did mention the decree, but I have not been able to find the reference.

Now this year the feast of St. Patrick falls on a Wednesday during Lent. If my memory serves me right, the good, holy man, Pius X, gave all Catholics living in a parish having St. Patrick as a patron the privilege of eating meat on that day, provided the feast is observed in a solemn way in that parish church. By a solemn observance of the feast day, I presume that it is meant there is a High Mass, a sermon, etc. Am I right in this?

Now I think we can go a step further. I am not sure of the wording of the decree, but I believe it permitted the interpretation, at least, that any parish having a majority of its members either of Irish birth or descent and observing St. Patrick's Day in a solemn manner would be entitled to the same privilege as if St. Patrick were the patronal saint. Am I right in this?

We have many churches dedicated to St. John the Baptist; to the Blessed Virgin Mary, etc. Suppose the feast day falls on Friday, but it is observed in a solemn manner in such churches. If I am correct in my contention, the people of such parishes enjoy a privilege which it seems they are not aware of. Consequently a solution of this question will be of interest to many readers of the REVIEW.

M.

Resp. The S. Congregation of Council (3 May, 1912) published a letter regarding the observance of liturgical feasts formerly celebrated "de praecepto" but suppressed by Apostolic Letter of 2 July, 1911, which allows the continuance of solemnities for such feasts and contains the following clause: (Cf. *Acta Ap. Sed.*, Vol. IV, p. 341.)

Qua autem Christifideles magis excitentur ad supradictos dies festo pie sancteque excolendos, vigore praesentium litterarum, conceditur omnibus locorum Ordinariis ampla facultas dispensandi cum suis subditis super lege jejunii et abstinentiae, quoties dies abstinentiae vel jejunio consecratus incidat in festum quod licet praecepto non subjectum, cum debita populi frequentia devote celebratur.

Patronal and titulary feasts are included in this exemption, where they are solemnly celebrated with the "concursus populi". In such cases the local Ordinary has the faculty to dispense from the fast and abstinence. Pastors have not such powers for their churches, although they may dispense individuals under their jurisdiction.

ST. AUGUSTINE'S UNDERSTANDING OF JACOB'S LIE.

Qu. In reading the Lessons of the two Nocturns (I and II) in the Breviary Office for Quadragesima Sunday, St. Augustine is quoted as stating that Jacob in deceiving his father Isaac, and thereby robbing his brother Esau of the blessing which belonged to him by right of primogeniture, did not tell a lie: "Non est mendacium, sed mysterium." How can this be allowed in reason? The statement suggests a doubt of the correctness of St. Augustine's judgment, or else a mistranslation of his words as he wrote. Is there any explanation?

Resp. St. Augustine nowhere denies that Jacob told a deliberate lie. On the contrary he explicitly emphasizes the fact that the action was a lie and reprehensible as such. The whole discourse *Contra Mendacium* from which the Breviary citation is taken, shows this even if common sense did not demand that he so understood it. But the eminently reasonable Father of the Church distinguishes, and wishes the reader to distinguish, between the *action* and its *significance* in the inspired writer's mind. The act of Jacob was plainly a lie, to which he was induced against his own conscience by the natural love of his mother. But the Divine Spirit uses the deception of Jacob, in supplanting his brother in the inheritance, not in approval but for the purpose of an analogy to indicate a spiritual destiny by which a later generation than that of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, although not of the chosen people to whom the promise was made, but a race of adulterers and sinners, would take possession of the inheritance of the Church through Christ who took upon Himself their guilt. St. Augustine insists on this by his reference, as the careful reader of the Nocturn will notice. The Holy Ghost does not therefore inspire the sacred writer to record the lie, as if God approved it, but as though it became the occasion of a prophetic forecast, in which the elements of comparison permit the teaching of a lesson of truth in precisely the same manner as the Parable of the "Unjust Steward" is made to teach justice. This is the legitimate translation of "non est mendacium, sed mysterium".

CEREMONIAL FOR CONGREGATION AT MASS.

Qu. During the Forty Hours' Devotion is it proper for the congregation to rise when the priest enters the sanctuary to begin Mass? If the celebrant of the Sunday Mass reaches the Last Gospel while another priest is distributing Holy Communion, should the congregation rise or remain kneeling?

Resp. There is no prescribed or official ceremonial for assistance at Low Mass. Devotion, analogy, and custom, sanctioned by universal, local or long observance, are the chief criteria for practical guidance.

At High Mass the congregation observes the ceremonial of the clerical choir in the sanctuary. At Low Mass it seems proper to follow the ceremonies prescribed for the server, except when he is occupied in some act which demands a standing position. Accordingly the congregation stands during the reading by the celebrant of both Gospels in the Mass. The faithful rise likewise when the celebrant enters the sanctuary and when he leaves the sanctuary after the Mass. The server is not instructed to rise and stand during the recitation of the Credo, yet in many places the congregation rises to make, as it were, a profession of faith together with the priest. This custom was introduced in Rome at the Pope's Mass when a Carlovingian emperor had thus demonstrated his loyalty to the faith of the Holy See.

Our liturgist is of opinion that the congregation should stand at the last Gospel, even while the Blessed Sacrament is being distributed or exposed. There appears to be no reason for omitting a liturgical or quasi-liturgical act in favor of an accidental manifestation of devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, since the Mass itself testifies to that devotion.

APPLICATION OF THE "PAULINE PRIVILEGE".

Qu. The ecclesiastical court set up by the bishop of the diocese heard a case of annulment of marriage—through the Pauline Privilege; or "*ad cautelam* propter disparitatem cultus". The judge's decision was that the petitioner ought to receive the privilege sought. There is no possibility of new evidence, and the question was sifted as thoroughly as possible during the court's many sittings. What I should like to ask is—can the local Ordinary give the Pauline Privi-

lege on his own authority—in virtue, of course, of the faculties enjoyed by him from the Holy See; or must the entire case be submitted to the Roman Congregation to be tried all over again?

Resp. The Pauline Privilege is briefly the right, from the divine law, of a convert from infidelity, who has been married in infidelity and later baptized, to contract a new marriage with a Catholic, provided the infidel party refuses to be baptized or to allow the peaceful exercise of religion. Its character as a privilege is manifested in two ways especially: no convert is bound to make use of it, and it is of itself perpetual, and can be used at any time after conversion, provided the conditions are verified.

It is evident that great confusion would ensue if the use or the existence of the privilege were left to the judgment of the individual concerned. By the ecclesiastical law, it belongs to the Ordinary to establish the existence of the privilege. This is done by securing proper proof that the parties were unbaptized when they were married, and that the conditions laid down by the Apostle are present, the latter proof being obtained by the interpellations. The Ordinary cannot dispense from these, even if it is apparent that they will be without result. The right to dispense is reserved to the Holy See, and may be obtained by the Ordinary either by a general faculty or for a particular case.

In a particular case, therefore, when the Pauline privilege is to be used, the pastor first secures proof that the parties were not baptized previous to their marriage in infidelity, and that one of them was later baptized. He then refers the case to the Ordinary under whose authority the interpellations must be made, in the manner described in the Code (Can. 1122). When a negative answer has been received to the interpellations, the Ordinary does not grant a declaration of nullity of the former marriage, but declares the converted party free to marry a Catholic. The former marriage is dissolved only when the second is contracted. If the other party is baptized before the privilege is used, the right to use the privilege ceases. The Ordinary has no authority of himself to dispense from the interpellations, and it must also be noted that the general faculty which he may enjoy of dispensing from the

impediments of disparity and mixed religion cannot be employed when there is question of using the Pauline privilege.

The Ordinary in the case as described above may be compelled for various reasons to refer the case to Rome: there may be a doubt as to the baptism of the parties, or it may be necessary to secure a dispensation from the interpellations, or the converted party may desire to contract marriage with a non-Catholic.

PEW RENT AND DOMICILE.

Qu. Anthony moved out of a parish where there is Mass every Sunday on to a farm one mile from a mission chapel, where Mass is said once and sometimes twice a month. But he prefers to drive seven or eight miles to the church he moved from because he hears Mass every Sunday. He contributes his share to the mission church but wants to hold his pew in the old church. May the pastor accept his pew rent? If so, in case of sickness can he call this pastor or must he call the priest who attends the mission?

Resp. A pastor can accept pew rent from those who are not members of the parish, as it is merely the payment of a sum of money for the privilege of occupying a certain seat. Moreover, since a Catholic is free to attend Mass in any Catholic church, he is also free to secure there the accommodations available.

Domicile or quasi-domicile is the determining factor when there is question of the parish to which any individual belongs (Can. 94). The pastor of the domicile has the right and the obligation of administering Extreme Unction to his parishioners, since this is a function reserved to the pastor (Can. 462, § 3). The payment of pew rent in another church does not of itself confirm membership in that parish, nor grant to that pastor the right to exercise parochial functions. There exists, however, in many dioceses an old custom, sometimes reenforced by synodal regulations, which permits the pastor of the Church in which the pew is held to administer all the Sacraments to his pew-holders wherever they reside. If such a custom or regulation does not exist, the pastor of the parish of actual residence must be summoned.

INDULGENCES ON TRANSLATED FEAST.

Qu. At the dedication of our church we obtained a special indulgence to be gained on the anniversary by all who visit the church on that day. The feast is celebrated with solemn Mass at which all the school children and people attend who are free from obligation to work. Next year, as I see from the new ordo, the feast of Corpus Christi interferes with our anniversary celebration and we propose to have the solemnity transferred to the following Sunday. Do those who visit the church on the Sunday gain the indulgence, or must they attend on the anniversary of the original date of consecration?

Resp. If the translation of the day to which the indulgence is attached is accidental (that is to say, not perpetual), and the celebration is restricted to the private office and Mass on account of liturgical rules, the indulgence is gained on the day of the anniversary. But if the public celebration of the feast of consecration is perpetually transferred, the indulgence is also transferred. "Cum festum cui adnexa sit aliqua indulgentia, legitime quidem, sed ad tempus tantummodo et absque solemnitate atque externa celebratione transfertur, indulgentia diei affixa manet tum etiam cum festum transfertur ob occursum feriae VI in Parasceve" (S. Poenit., 18 February, 1921).

THE BALTIMORE COUNCIL AND THE NEW CODE.

Qu. Has the legislation of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore for the United States been abrogated by the new Code of Canon Law, so that we are no longer bound by the former?

May the bishop, since he is said to be pope in his own diocese, make decrees and decisions for his clergy which are contrary to the Code or to the immemorial traditions of the place?

Resp. The laws and statutes of the Plenary Councils are still binding in so far as they do not contravene the general and positive prescriptions of the new Code. The exercise of legislative power by the diocesan bishops is understood to be limited to the interpretation of and to facilitate the execution of the general law in its application to local conditions in so far as this law calls for the authoritative judgment and sanction of the Ordinary. The latter has no legitimate power to abrogate the common law, though he may, if it be deemed necessary

for the tranquility and good order of the Church under his jurisdiction, suspend the carrying out of the law for the time being. Traditions which are contrary to the fundamental law are to be abrogated with discretion (Cf. *A. A. S.*, 1921, p. 228; Toso, *Comment. ad Cod.*, III, Can. 335).

KISSING THE BISHOP'S RING AT COMMUNION.

Qu. When a bishop officiates at Mass and when the faithful receive Holy Communion from the hands of the bishop, what is the liturgical significance of kissing the episcopal ring before receiving? Is the kissing of the episcopal ring a strict obligation or merely a matter of custom?

In seeking information on this matter, I wish to be correctly understood. The writer has no objection to the kissing of the episcopal ring whether it be a strict obligation or merely a matter of custom. We have, however, on certain occasions found the act to be somewhat distasteful — not the kissing of the episcopal ring, but the circumstances connected with such an act. Particularly does it appear so at our annual retreat. On the closing morning of the retreat, all the priests who have been in retreat as a general thing receive Communion at the bishop's Mass. The writer has observed that often the ring is not only touched by the lips of the one kissing it, but sometimes it is inserted in the mouth of the person. When this occurs, it is a serious distraction to the person who is about to receive the Sacred Host, and is strongly repugnant.

The writer has in mind at the present writing a certain institution to which people suffering from all manner of diseases go for treatment. The bishop says his daily Mass at this institution, which is the community Mass, and very often some of the patients of this institution receive Communion at the bishop's Mass. His Lordship never fails to insist that the ring be kissed, since he holds the Sacred Host in his fingers, with the finger on which he wears his ring extended, until this practice has been complied with. Some of the faithful refrain from going to Holy Communion at the bishop's Mass, because they dislike kissing the episcopal ring on account of the carelessness of some who touch the ring not only with their lips but also with their tongue. It may be alleged that these people are too sensitive about the transmission of infectious germs, but even granting that this may be true, it must be admitted that it gives rise to great repugnance. The writer feels that it must in like manner be distasteful to many of our bishops, and we are sure no bishop would insist on the practice unless it were a strict obligation.

INFIRMARIUS.

Resp. The direction of the ceremonial which prescribes the kissing of the bishop's ring at Communion is intended as an act of reverence for a salutary purpose. Where it evidently cannot be performed without grave inconvenience, danger, or a suggestion of irreverence, it should be omitted. This allows the communicant simply to hold out the tongue for receiving the Sacred Host.

PRIVATE BENEDICTION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.

Qu. I find a custom here of giving Benediction with the pyx (ciborium) after the celebration of (non-solemn) marriages. Sometimes the marriage celebrations take place at different hours, and the Benediction with the Blessed Sacrament is repeated in each case. Is this permissible?

Resp. Any just cause of enhancing the solemnity of devotion suffices for what liturgists call "Private Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament". This excludes only the exposition as an act for the priest's exclusive personal devotion. As a minister of the Holy Eucharist he may give it to any person or number of persons of the faithful, provided he observes the prescribed rite of wearing the sacred vestments (at least surplice and stole), having the prescribed number of lights, and reciting the Tantum Ergo with the versicle and oration belonging to it, before imparting the actual Benediction after donning the humeral veil. The incensing and chanting, as well as other acts of devotion (prayers), are optional.

There is accordingly no law forbidding the above-mentioned practice; indeed it may serve to impress the attendants at the marriage ceremony more deeply with the sacredness of the contract when there is no solemn Mass.

ATTENDING MASS OUT OF THE PARISH.

Qu. A Catholic family lives over the county line in another diocese, but only three miles from a church in the diocese in which they do not live. The road to this church is good and level. They are five miles away from the church to which they should belong because of the county line, which puts them in that diocese. But the road is bad and hilly. All their predecessors attended the nearer church. May the pastor encourage them in this? It is a question of attend-

ing the nearer church or none at all during most of the fall and winter.

Resp. Canon 467, § 2, shows the wide range of liberty which the faithful now enjoy in the fulfilling of their religious obligations. "The faithful should be instructed to attend their parish churches frequently, where this can be conveniently done, and be present at the divine offices and hear the Word of God." A Catholic, therefore, is not bound to hear Mass in his own parish church; he should be urged to attend Mass there frequently, and thus identify himself with his fellow parishioners, and become acquainted with parish needs and activities. This, however, does not import a strict obligation which can be insisted upon by his parish priest. Where any inconvenience is involved there is not even the obligation arising from decency to attend his own church.

It is not good *esprit de corps* for a pastor to encourage members of another parish to attend his church to the exclusion of their own parish church. On the other hand, he should not deter them from so doing, particularly when they can attend their own church only at great inconvenience. This exercise of religious freedom in attending Mass does not excuse from the obligation of supporting one's own parish church.

THE CLERICAL SHAVER.

Qu. Our vicar forane at a recent conference was scandalized on seeing one of the clerical brethren appear with a red beard of two weeks' growth, which the owner blamed on his unbroken wanderings without a razor during a mission tour, from which he had returned just in time to attend the meeting.

A discussion arose at once as to his canonical status since here was an open violation of the law forbidding the wearing of a beard. The vicar was asked to decide what censures or suspensions the innocent victim of missionary circumstances had incurred, for it might affect the process of impending promotions. Our barbarian brother, however, maintained that, having received his first tonsure on entering sacred orders, he was not obliged to another, and that the unshaven pride of his confrères was merely the result of custom for which there existed no canon law. He challenged the vicar or bishop to demonstrate the contrary. Whereupon someone proposed that the question be referred to the REVIEW by SINE BARBA.

Resp. There is no general canon law forbidding clerics to wear a beard. A universal custom, however, in the Latin Church having the force of unwritten law may be insisted upon by diocesan authority. This custom, while it may be confirmed by diocesan statute, could not, according to the teaching of canonists, be ignored or abrogated by the authority of the Ordinary. Only the Holy See has power to abrogate, under changed conditions, the commonly recognized law or custom in disciplinary matters. In individual cases, reasons of health or even convenience, are sufficient to dispense, plus the consent of the Ordinary. (Cf. *Act. Ap. Sedis,* 1920, pp. 45-47; also *Codic. Commentar.,* Toso, ad Can. 136.)

IMPEDIMENTUM IMMEDIATE ANTE NUPTIAS CONTRAHENDAS DETECTUM.

Qu. A young couple had announced their intention of marriage, the bride being a resident of the parish, while the groom lived in a neighboring town. We published the banns in the usual form three times; and the nuptials were to take place on the third Sunday in the afternoon. After High Mass on the last day a physician of our town called at the rectory, and referring to the proposed marriage, plainly revealed a condition which, I knew, constituted a diriment impediment requiring episcopal dispensation, though I said nothing to him and am not certain that he himself realized the possible effect of the information he had given me in the intimate manner in which such matters are discussed among professional men.

When the doctor had gone I began to doubt whether I should make inquiry of the bride and hold back the marriage until I had obtained the necessary dispensation. On consulting my curate, who is somewhat of a canonist, he thought that the ceremony should go on, as a postponement would cause a sort of public scandal, whereas the matter might be rectified by a subsequent "sanatio". He cited Canon 1045 as justification for proceeding with the marriage. We acted on this suggestion at the time. When later I saw the bishop, he seemed displeased that I had not come before the marriage to get the requisite dispensation, though he did not plainly say that I had violated the law. What would the REVIEW have advised under the circumstances?

Resp. The information received from the physician in the manner described cannot be regarded as an official denunciation of the impediment, even if incidentally it was occasioned

by the announcement of the marriage banns. It is not likely that the doctor intended to prevent or delay the nuptials at the risk of his reputation by violating what comes evidently under the head of a professional secret. The pastor could accordingly ignore it for the time being, reserving inquiry for a later period, and meantime performing the ceremony. Such is the tenor of Canon 1045 as shown by an interpretation of the Pontifical Commission (1 March, 1921) which reads: "Ad normam can. 1045, § 1, clausula *quoties impedimentum detegatur cum jam omnia sunt parata ad nuptias* hoc sensu intelligenda est, quod quamvis antea cognitum, tunc solum tamen impedimentum ad notitian parochi aut Ordinarii delatum sit."

OUT-DOOR STATIONS OF THE CROSS.

Attention has been recently called to the benefits arising from the edifying custom of erecting Stations of the Cross in cemeteries and in convent and other institutional grounds, as the traveler through Catholic countries in Europe frequently sees them. The suggestion, coming from a zealous Redemptorist missionary, has been taken up by a good iron firm in a way which is likely to commend itself to the clergy. A sample of the bronze tablets sent us, together with an illustrated folder, betokens a fine artistic and religious sense, and justifies our recommending the designs as likely to promote piety in a way which is practicable as a popular devotion.

Ecclesiastical Library Table

RECENT HYMNOLOGY.

The attraction exercised by Latin hymns upon the affection of our separated brethren receives its latest emphasis in the volume of *Hymns Original and Translated* (Philadelphia, 1925) by Louis F. Benson. It contains thirty-eight original hymns and sixteen translations from the Latin. The Rev. Dr. Benson has been most prominently identified throughout his long life with Presbyterian hymnology, composing not alone many hymns but as well several standard volumes on hymnology, marked by great research and an enthusiasm, at once charming and inspiring, for his self-imposed task. It will interest us to note his selection of the Latin material, some of it already familiar to us, but a great portion of it doubtless unfamiliar to many. To the former category belong: *Jam lucis orto sidere, Splendor paternae gloriae, Stabat Mater dolorosa* (30 lines), *O salutaris Hostia, Veni Sancte Spiritus, Veni Creator Spiritus;* to the latter: *Nil laudibus nostris eges* ("Charles Coffin in the Paris Breviary, 1736"), *Deus Pater ingenite* ("formerly ascribed to Hilary of Poictiers in the fourth century"), *Crux ave benedicta* ("of unknown authorship, probably of 17th century"), *Plaudite coeli* ("of unknown authorship, seventeenth century"), *O Christe qui noster poli* ("of unknown authorship in the Cluniac Breviary, 1686"), *Nobis Olympo redditus* ("Jean-Baptiste de Santeuil, the text of 1698"), *Salvator mundi, Domine* ("of unknown authorship of the sixth or seventh century, Mone thinks"), *O Pater sancte mitis atque pie* ("of unknown authorship, eleventh century"), *Ter sancte, ter potens Deus* ("Claude de Santeuil in the Paris Breviary, 1736"), *O luce qui mortalibus* ("Charles Coffin in the Paris Breviary, 1736"). As an illustration of the felicity of translation the *Jam lucis orto sidere* may be quoted:

The sun is up! now, brothers, come;
And, kneeling, let us pray:—
Or going forth or turning home,
God send us safe to-day.

His hand be like a bridle-rein
Held firm but lovingly;
His grace enfold us, to restrain
Our eyes from vanity.

God cleanse our lives from innermost,
God guard them from outside;
For fear life's simpler ways be lost
In luxury or pride.

That when the day is done, and night
Comes down by His decree,
His praise be still our heart's delight,
Our hearts from care still free.

Now let us rise, for it is meet
That all together say,
Praise Father, Son, and Paraclete,
Forever and alway.

A selection from the author's hymns is given in the exquisitely bound little volume, of which only three hundred copies have been printed, the author's purpose being expressed in Ophelia's pathetic phrase, "that's for remembrance". "The casual discovery", he writes in his Preface, "of an interval of forty-seven years between the dates of the earliest hymn and the latest suggested that the time to fulfill" his purpose of gathering a selection from his hymnal compositions in a little volume had arrived. The long retrospect indicates the absorbing character of his devotion to hymnology and suggests also the thought lying behind the Dedication of his work, whose sub-title is Catholic—"All Souls' Day". Its brevity and beauty recommend its quotation as an example of the author's original work:

ALL SOULS' DAY.

A road soon lost in shadow either way;
Bared boughs above against the darkening gray;
The hush of a November afternoon,
Too late for sunshine and for stars too soon:

Soft breaths of twilight that unspoken fall
About God's House, beyond the roadside wall
Guarding inviolate its graves; a gate
Where they who come keep tryst with them that wait:—

Peace to all friends remembered or forgot;
And to all friends the love that changes not,
If they have caught the sunrise from the hill
Or at my side are pressing forward still.

An additional value is given to the volume in the fact that the English translations are placed side by side with the Latin texts, thus permitting an easy comparison in respect both of fidelity and of felicity of rendering.

* * *

Herself a poet, St. Teresa of the Child Jesus has been honored by three hymns in her Divine Office. The Latin texts

and English versified renderings were published in the REVIEW for February, 1924, page 185. I am informed that the hymn for Lauds has been revised and a copy of the revision has been promised me. Meanwhile, a Sequence (not intended for use in the Mass, however) has been composed in her honor by a Benedictine of Solesmes, who has also furnished his poem with an original setting in plainsong. The Sequence is sung at Lisieux during Solemn Benediction. An English rendering, fully rhymed like the original Latin and also in equivalent English rhythms, was published in *Carmel* (Wheeling, W. Va., September, 1925). Apparently the Latin text has not yet appeared in print, at least in this country. From a manuscript copy furnished me it may prove interesting to print here the Latin text side by side with the translation into English.

SEQUENCE IN HONOR OF ST. THÉRÈSE OF THE CHILD JESUS.

Gaude, juncta Domino,
Rosa cujus folia
Sparsa Jesu Parvulo
Micant inter lilia.

Sponsum ab infantia
Fide nosti quaerere
Quem jugi laetitia
Conspicis in aethere.

Sancto ducta Flamine,
Simplex illi dedita
Amoris dulcedine,
Pacis intras abdita.

Patiendi studio
Intus gerens fortia,
Dolentes solatio
Foves suavissima.

Ancilla sororibus,
Dum advolas humilis,
Piae mentis obvius
Adest Deus oculis.

Illi semper modica
Placebas obsequiis;
Potens tuis maxima
Contulit suspiriis.

In cœli splendoribus
Tibi nunc est solium;
Radians virtutibus
Diadema gaudium.

Jam choreis Virginum,
O Teresa, jungeris;
Perenniter Dominum
Quo graditur sequeris.

Close to God, rejoice, thou bright
Rose, whose petals, opening wide
For the Christ-Child's sole delight,
Midst the lilies fair abide.

Faith had taught your childish feet
Whither they should run to find
That dear Spouse Whom now you greet
In the heavenly heights enshrined.

Simple-hearted, sweetly fed
On his love without surcease,
Thou wast by the Spirit led
To the hidden things of peace.

Oh, with what a holy zeal
Thou didst yearn to suffer much,
Finding thus the way to heal
Others' wounds with gentle touch.

Servant of the Sister-band,
Thou didst hasten to be kind,
Knowing God was near at hand,
Ever visioned in thy mind.

Surely thou didst please Him well,
By thy little duties done:
Thee, in turn, His gifts befel,
By thy slightest wishes won.

In the splendorous Court of Heav'n,
Compassed 'round with glory now,
What a diadem is giv'n
To thine ever-joyous brow!

Thou hast joined the Virgin-choir,
O Teresa! Whitherso
Goeth Christ, thy Heart's Desire,
Thou in His white train dost go.

Sis promissi, quaesumus,
Dulcis, memor, anima;
Regnans in sideribus,
Terris funde munera.

Cernis quot malitiis
Judicem offendimus:
Tuis fiat meritis
Erratis propitius.

Sanctis da vestigiis
Inhaerere famulos,
Et Jesum in modicis
Factos sequi parvulos.

Compotes ut patriae
Inter chores coelitum,
Summae Regem gloriae
Laudemus per saeculum.
Amen.

Oh, remember, loving Soul,
What thou'st promised to our dearth:
Now that thou hast gained the goal,
Pour thy promised gifts on earth.

Thou dost know how many ways
We offend against our King:
On thy merits may He gaze
And forgive our wandering!

Pray thy clients still may press
Forward on the narrow path—
Childlike hearts that Christ will bless,
Such as Heaven's Kingdom hath:

That with thee we, too, may stand
Safe upon that farther shore,
And in God's dear Fatherland
Sing His praise forevermore!
Amen.

Composed as a *rhythmus* (like the *Adoro Te devote* attributed to the Angelic Doctor), this Sequence may seem to labor under accentual difficulties in more than one line. Thus in the third stanza we find the third line apparently accentuating the word *amoris* on the first syllable, while the second syllable, long and penultimate, should bear the accent; and similarly with *dolentes* in the next stanza, and *erratis* in the antepenultimate stanza, while *perenniter* in the eighth stanza seems to call for accentuation on the short penultimate syllable. Many such apparent clashes between the rhythmic and the tonic accents could be cited; but doubtless the line *Dum advolas humilis,* which apparently gives the accent to the short second syllable of *advolas,* will startle the English-speaking reader most of all. The difficulty is not fully met by a citation of such clashes as we find everywhere in the Breviary hymns in quantitative measures, as, for instance, in the fairly famous iambic line at Terce: *Rectór poténs veráx Deús,* which gives plainsong commentators and expositors some difficulty in handling. For in cases like this—whatever difficulties may confront singers in choir—we have illustrations of quantitative measures which only faultily are identified in their rhythmic cadences with modern accentual verse. If a composer selects accentual rhythm, why should he not be held to an agreement between tonic and rhythmic accent? One might, indeed, answer the question by opening any English hymnbook and showing similar clashes of accents. An additional answer would be to consult a collection of medieval hymns in accen-

tual rhythms and note such clashes in abundance. Still another answer might be found in the lightness of the tonic accent in French, which, by the way, "methods" for learning French occasionally warn the reader does not really exist, but which the ears of English-speaking folk testify as existing in practice. Howbeit, the *rhythmus* was probably not intended for private poetical reading, but only for singing—and in the function of singing the clash is not so perceptible.

* * *

But to return now to the previous question of English renderings of Latin hymns, attention should be called to a little brochure (xiv-107 pages) issued by the Salve Regina Press at the Catholic University, Washington, D. C., in 1924. The volume bears the title: "Our Lady's Life in Verse", while a subtitle explains: "English Translations of Sacred Latin Song." The Preface explains that the scope of the book is not adequately expressed in the title, and adds: "This Anthology has taken, from the great storehouse of Latin song, a number of hymns dealing with events in the life of our Lady, Queen of Heaven, and has arranged translations (all of which are by the Compiler) of these hymns in such a fashion as to form a somewhat coherent and consecutive—although, necessarily, not a thoroughly connected—biography of the Blessed Virgin." Regret has been expressed that the translations were not confronted with the original Latin texts for purposes of comparison. The book was clearly intended, however, rather for the devout laity than for the "student in his pensive citadel." In this connexion, nevertheless, it may be noted that it has several points of interest, quite apart from the question of fidelity to the original texts. For instance, the hymns for the Feast of the Apparition of the Blessed Virgin Mary Immaculate (11 February) are translated. Of these, Dom Britt, O.S.B., notes that the Matins hymn, *Te dicimus praeconio*, of unknown authorship, has been rendered into English verse by Archbishop Bagshawe alone ("there are no other translations"). The hymn deserves to have at least one other translation into English. Archbishop Bagshawe attempted extreme literalness or fidelity to the original, generally at the expense of poetical charm. Naturally, this hymn does not appear in the excellent volume, "The Day Hours of the Church", edited

by the Benedictine Nuns of Stanbrook, Worcester, England, which does not concern itself with the Matins Office. The hymn for Lauds, on the other hand, does find place there, and it would seem that Archbishop Bagshawe's rendering was not deemed desirable for the "Day Hours", since a new translation of the *Aurora soli praevia* is furnished by the Nuns themselves. Even here, it is fairly obvious, great literalness or fidelity was desired, since each quatrain contains only two rhymes. Much of the pleasure of English verse is thus curtailed, and the question is precipitated as to the degree of fidelity desirable in English versified renderings of Latin hymns. As the hymn in question is short, perhaps my readers will indulge me in some effort at comparison and illustration. First of all, the Latin text will be confronted with the most recent translation, namely that found in "Our Lady's Life in Verse." This confrontation is especially appropriate inasmuch as the English rendering is fully rhymed throughout:

Aurora soli praevia, Felix salutis nuncia, In noctis umbra plebs tua Te, Virgo, supplex invocat.	O Dawn that heraldest the Day— The Saviour that shall be— In gloom of earthly night we pray And lift our eyes to thee.
Torrens nefastis fluctibus Cunctos trahens voragine, Leni residit aequore Cum transit Arca foederis.	The thronging waves that threat the sky With storming mutiny, When Safety's Ark is passing by Become a gentle sea.
Dum torret arescens humus, Tu rore sola spargeris: Tellure circum rorida, Intacta sola permanes.	When all the flowers are parched with heat, Thou art refreshed with dew; When tempests o'er the others beat, Thy bloom untouched we view.
Fatale virus evomens Attollit anguis verticem: At tu draconis turgidum Invicta conteris caput.	When Satan with uplifted brow His venom far would spread, With virgin-heel, O Mary, thou Dost crush the serpent's head.
Mater benigna, respice Fletus precesque supplicum, Et dimicantes tartari Victrix tuere ab hostibus.	O Mother, look with glance benign Upon our tears and prayers, And by that sinless power of thine Save us from hellish snares.
Jesu tibi sit gloria, Qui natus es de Virgine, Cum Patre et almo Spiritu In sempiterna saecula.	To Thee, O Jesus, glory meet, The Virgin Mary's Son; To Father and to Paraclete Be equal honor done.

The translations by Archbishop Bagshawe and the Benedictine Nuns are alike in giving only one pair of rhymes to each quatrain, fidelity to the original being thus easier to at-

tain than in a series of fully rhymed stanzas. The two versions are unlike in the alternate lines, the alternation of 8-syllable with 7's being more pleasant to our ear than a solid and unbroken succession of 8's:

Archbishop Bagshawe	*Benedictine Nuns*
O Dawn, that dost precede the Sun, Of our salvation Herald bright, Thy aid, O Virgin, we invoke, Who live in this life's gloomy night.	O rosy Dawn! that dost proclaim, Salvation's happy day, To thee, O Virgin, 'mid night's shades, Thy people humbly pray.
The torrent with its evil waves, Which drags all men to misery, Subsides into a gentle sea, When God's own Ark is passing by.	The torrent, that engulfs all those Within its whirlpool drawn, Rests calm as o'er its softened wave The ark of God is borne.
Thou only art refreshed with dew, When the sun burns the torrid plain, When all around with dew is dank, Thou only dost untouched remain.	While earth is parched with scorching heat, Alone art thou bedewed; With dew o'erspread the earth around, And thou untouched art viewed.
Its fatal poison threatening, The serpent lifts its fangs so dread, But, thou, unconquered Maid, dost crush The cruel monster's swelling head.	The serpent rears his head aloft Disgorging poisoned spleen; But thou his proud, inflated head Dost crush with power as Queen.
Thy clients' humble prayer and tears Regard with pity, Virgin kind, Grant that from hellish foes we may, Through thy strong arm, protection find.	O loving Mother, hear our pray'r, As suppliant we cry; Protect us in our strife with hell Who dost its power defy.
Jesus, to Thee be glory given, Whom erst the Virgin Mother bore, With Father and with Holy Ghost, Through endless ages evermore.	O Jesus, born of Virgin bright, All glory be to Thee, With Father and with Paraclete, Through all eternity.

There is hardly a stanza here that would not bear large comment, but attention may be directed solely to the second and third. One is somewhat confused at the picture drawn in the Latin text, and faithfully copied in the translations just given, of a torrent changed into a sea by the passage of an ark. One may similarly be confused in the next stanza by the picture of an implied flower which alone blooms in an arid soil, but which is untouched by the dew that covers all else. If there be any fault here, it is not one attributable to the too faithful translators. What did the original poet really have in mind? Dom Britt gives us a literal translation of the stanza: "When the dry earth is parched, thou alone art besprinkled with dew; when the earth on every side is wet with dew, thou alone dost remain untouched (cf. Judges, 6:37)". Now the reference

to Judges explains, indeed, the first half of the stanza, the fleece of Gideon bearing abundance of dew whilst "all the ground beside" was dry. It does not pretend to explain the contradictoriness of typical allusion, namely the picture of a flower (Our Lady) lacking dew when all else is refreshed by it. "Drop down dew, O ye heavens!" A concluding reflection might seem justified, that the Latin poet, not unlike his vernacular brethren, is at times hard put to it to compress his thought adequately within specified limitations of stanzaic form and classical metre. The translator, equally hampered by matters of stanzaic form, rhymes and rhythms, is assuredly not held to the literal expedients of the original poet in his devious attempts to compass all the requirements of his self-assumed task. Let the translator gather the true thought which the Latin poet has tried to express, and then strive to put that thought into his own language with a free choice of whatsoever expedients offer themselves in order to meet his own special requirements. He is entitled to a freedom of selection at least approximating that which the Latin poet vindicates to himself.

There is a third hymn for the same Feast, the *Omnis expertem maculae Mariam* (II Vespers). Dom Britt notes that there are two versions of it in English, and quotes the translation by the Benedictine Nuns in the "Day Hours." Here, again, the version of the overly literal Archbishop is rejected, although he attempted to give some intimation, in his rendering of the Sapphic stanza of the original:

> Through Him who is Teacher supreme of the Faith,
> That Mary is free from all stain we believe,
> And through all the nations the Faithful with joy
> Her triumph receive.

Dom Britt gives a literal translation: "The supreme teacher of faith solemnly affirms that Mary is free from all stain; the faithful everywhere rejoicing celebrate the triumph of the Virgin." We can admire, if we will, the great fidelity of the Archbishop's version to the phraseology of the original Latin.

The versions given in the "Day Hours" and "Our Lady's Life" make no attempt to echo the Sapphic strains, save that the latter makes the fourth line shorter than the equal lengths of the other three lines:

Day Hours	*Our Lady's Life*
Lo! Mary is exempt from stain of sin, Proclaims the Pontiff high; And earth applauding celebrates with joy Her triumph, far and nigh.	"A Queen unstained by Adam's fall!" We list the Unerring Teacher's voice: In Mary's triumph shall not all The faithful earth rejoice?

Only the last version quoted provides the reader with the pleasure of full rhyming, the other two translations contenting themselves with a single pair of rhymes for the four-lined stanza. Meanwhile, the thought—although not the phraseology—of the Latin appears to be as adequately presented in the full-rhymed stanza as in either of the other two renderings.

* * *

The Benedictine Nuns of Stanbrook are to be felicitated on their exquisite volume of the "Day Hours", complete and compact and beautifully printed; and it is a pleasure to note that they are now engaged in the translation and editing of a volume of the Matins Office. When this is completed, we shall have in a handy and presumably much less expensive form than the Marquess of Bute's translation, a full English rendering of the Divine Office that will include not alone additional Feasts but all the changes in rubrics and arrangement made necessary by the fundamental revision of the Breviary under Pius X, as well as by subsequent declarations of the Congregation of Sacred Rites. The devout and cultured laity will thus have opportunity to follow easily the liturgical year of the Church.

H. T. HENRY

Washington, D. C.

Criticisms and Notes

THEOLOGIA FUNDAMENTALIS SECUNDUM S. THOMAE DOCTRINAM DE REVELATIONE PER ECCLESIAM CATHOLICAM PROPOSITA, Auctore P. Fr. Reg. Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P. Romae, Libreria Editrice Religiosa, F. Ferrari, via dei Cestari, 2. 1925. Pp. 666.

IL RIVELATORE. Auctore P. Mariano Cordovani, O.P. Pubblicazioni della Universita del Sacro Cuore. Societa Editrice "Vita e Pensiero". Milano. 1925. Pp. 482.

LECCIONES DE APOLOGETICA O FUNDAMENTOS DE LA FE CATOLICA. Para usos de los Cursos Superiores de Religion en Seminarios, Institutos, Liceos, Escuelas Normales y Professionales. Por el Presbitero Nicolas Martin Negueruela. Tomo I, Parte 1, ESPIRITUALISMO; Pp. 263. Tomo II, Parte 2, ORISTIANISMO; Parte 3. CATOLICISMO; Pp. 464. Tipografia Catolica Casals. Calle Caspe, 108 Barcelona. 1925.

Here are three organisms of religious thought exhibiting as many varieties of the same specific type. The type embodies a distinctive world-view; that, namely, which embraces a supernatural order of truths, facts, and activities in one sense transcending the entire order of natural phenomena and yet in another sense immanent therein. It is an order in which the Designer and Creator of the universe reveals certain aspects of Himself which He wishes man to recognize, certain truths which He wishes man to accept on faith, certain things which He wishes man to do. This whole order of truths is related to a sphere of activity in a future life wherein the Author both of the natural and the supernatural order reveals Himself proportionally to the endowments and acquired dispositions of men who pass hence in a state of will conformed to His plan and laws. The three books are conceived under this world-view. And in this they stand contrasted with the trilogy of English books on a kindred subject reviewed below. Each of the present three aims at demonstrating the objective existence of the supernatural order, that is, each presents the rational grounds or motives for believing in the existence of truths which God has actually revealed to man and which He means man to accept on faith. The first of the three is written by a French Dominican and comprises his lectures at the *Angelico,* the college of his Order in Rome. The second embodies the teaching of an Italian Dominican, a Professor in the Faculty of the Catholic University in Milan. The third is from the pen of a

Professor of Apologetics at the Catholic University of Puebla, Mexico.

P. Garrigou-Lagrange will doubtless be known to many of our readers through his masterly treatise on Theism, *Dieu, Son Existence et Sa Nature* (now, by the way, in its fifth edition); or by his philosophical critique, *Le Sens Commun, la Philosophie de l'Etre et les Formules Dogmatiques* (Paris, 3rd edit.). The present treatise covers the first part of Apologetics, the *Demonstratio Christiana* (the second part, the *Demonstratio Catholica,* being in course of preparation). It may be superfluous to say that the work reflects a breadth and depth of thought and a wealth of erudition quite on a par with the like qualities which we have previously noted in these pages as characteristic of his earlier productions. A devoted disciple of the Angelic Doctor, he explores to the depth the wisdom latent in the principles of the two *Summae.* The wealth of truth relating to the nature, possibility, "convenience", and necessity of a Divine revelation is set forth in the first part of the volume. The leading ideas are of course common to all books on the same subject, but Fr. Lagrange develops them with a constant eye to their modern setting over against the insidious attacks of naturalism, agnosticism, and pantheism. The second part of the volume treats of the existence of the Christian revelation as it is established by the historical testimony of Christ, the motives extrinsic and intrinsic of credibility, special emphasis being laid on the argument drawn from the transcendency of Christianity over Judaism, Buddhism, and Islamism. The volume concludes with a chapter on the obligation of accepting the Christian Revelation—an obligation which is shown to rest on States as well as on individuals, albeit the fulfilling thereof in the former case is freighted with tremendous difficulties and perplexities under the present conditions of interconflicting churches. Those who acclaim legally unrestricted liberty of worship to be the *ideal* social condition will find no support in Fr. Lagrange's endorsement of Louis Veuillot's outspoken demand: "*J'exige de vous au nom de vos principes la liberté que je vous refuse au nom des miens.* Though the subject matter easily lends itself to the imaginational flights of rhetoric, Fr. Lagrange keeps his thought firmly under the check of the logical rein and his Latin style close to the model set by the Angelic Doctor.

The Italian work above, *Il Rivelatore,* deals with the fact of Divine Revelation in a manner that may be called *original* in the best sense of the term. Lecturing at a University which is frequented by students of jurisprudence, philosophy, and the arts, as well as theology, Professor Cordovani recognizes that he should pre-

sent his subject in touch with his intellectual environment. Too many of our manuals appear to him as though they had been planned and worked out in a hermitage, aloof from all contact with modern culture and movements of thought: without any consideration for the errant and rebellious minds beyond the cloister and with an antagonistic spirit which does harm to true science and no good to the cause of faith. Accordingly he feels the need of sounding in his work an echo of all the voices of the intellectual world and of replying to them with the golden tongue of "the Christian wisdom". In accord with this spirit he treats of Revelation first in its connexion with the modern currents of philosophy; secondly with history, and thirdly in its social aspects. As the intellectual environment in which he writes is chiefly Italian, he considers Revelation as seen in the light or rather the twilight — or perhaps better the misleading allures—of the Italian philosophisms, especially the Rosminian and Giobertian Ontologism, the Traditionalism of Ventura, and the Idealism of Gentili. In opposition to these misconceptions of Revelation he sets the philosophical principles of St. Thomas in which Revealed Truth and Law are seen to be neither the term of a mental intuition of God nor the natural product of the human mind, but an addition from without — an addition, however, so consonant with man's needs, aspirations and powers, that once it is received it elevates and perfects human nature, which it disposes and prepares for a fuller and open manifestation of God Himself in a future life.

While the first part of the volume deals with Revelation as it is understood, or rather as it is misunderstood, by the more influential Italian philosophers, the second part brings out explicitly the significance of the title *Il Rivelatore* by considering the personality and doctrine of Jesus Christ, the Divine Revealer Himself. Though the author disclaims dealing exhaustively with either the documents which narrate the life of Jesus Christ or with His claims to be the Son of God and the Revealer of God's message to mankind, nevertheless he does establish both these truths in a manner that is at once striking and convincing. Especially solid and incisive is his treatment of our Lord's miracles and prophesies—notably the Resurrection — in the face of the modern trend of criticism championed by Renan, Harnack, Loisy, Le Roy, and the modernists generally. These chapters are certainly the most valuable part of the book. Hardly less so, however, is the third part which treats of Revelation and Society—*il Regno di Dio*. The Kingdom of God and the Gospels, the finality of the Church as the custodian of Revelation; the constitution, transcendency, necessity, and "Romanicity" of the Kingdom—these more or less familiar topics are handled in a style that

lends to them the freshness of novelty and realizes the author's intention of presenting an ancient theme in a modern costume.

The *Lecciones de Apologetica* covers at one point the subject matter discussed in the two preceding works, but beyond that it ranges over the broad ground of philosophy and theology upon which the Catholic Faith is immediately based. The possibility, necessity, and criteria of Revelation are succinctly treated on the traditional lines. The reason, however, for introducing the work here is mainly to signalize the method whereby not only these topics but the whole substructure of the supernatural order is established. Both philosophically and didactically the method is ideal. It comes as near perfection as one can reasonably look for. The ground plan is naturally synthetic. In three main parts, it surveys the domain of *spiritualism* (not spiritism), Christianism, and Catholicism. In the first volume, after the preliminary introduction, an outline of Theism is unfolded, the arguments for the existence of God being severally expounded, the attributes of God explained, and the philosophy of human nature (the existence of the soul, its spirituality, immortality, etc.) epitomized. Extreme (materialistic and atheistic, as well as Bergsonian) Evolution is refuted and a moderate form defended as probable. The second volume, opening with an outline study of religion in general, passes rapidly to a consideration of supernatural Revelation, the historical bases of Christianity and the motives of credibility, and thence to the constitution, notes and properties of the Church and the interrelations of Church and State. The volume closes with an appendix wherein certain points of controversy are considered, such as the Bible and various sciences, the Church and civilization, the Inquisition, Galileo, etc. Within the limits of its scope and purpose it would be hard to find a better systematized manual of apologetics. It is essentially a greatly condensed text-book and therefore supposes a competent teacher. Priests who read Spanish at all will welcome the succinct outlines — with divisions and subdivisions all numbered and typographically discriminated—and particularly the thorough synoptical indexes, as a ready help in preparing lectures or instructions.

It may not be superfluous to add that, besides the strong commendation given to the book by the Bishop of Concepcion, Chile, the work has been so arranged as to conform to the Official Program of the University of Chile. If the book may be taken as an indication of the solid and timely instruction provided for the youth and the intelligent laity generally in Latin America we have to congratulate our Catholic brethren beyond the Rio Grande.

SCIENCE, RELIGION AND REALITY. By Arthur James, Earl of Balfour, O.M., F.R.S., Bronislaw Malinowski, Ph.D., D.Sc., Charles Singer, D. Litt., Antonio Aliotta, D. Phil., Arthur S. Eddington, M.A., F.R.S., Joseph Needham, M.A., John W. Oman, D. Phil., D.D., William Brown, M.A., M.D., D.Sc., Clement C. J. Webb, M.A., LL.D., William Ralph Inge, D.D., LL.D. Edited by Joseph Needham. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1925. Pp. 396.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF SCIENCE TO RELIGION. By Shailer Mathews, Dean of the Divinity School, University of Chicago. With the cooperation of William E. Ritter, Robert A. Millikan, Edwin B. Frost, Edward B. Mathews, C. Judson Herrick, John M. Coulter, Ellsworth Faris, Charles H. Judd, John M. Dodson, Charles B. Davenport, C-E. A. Winslow, Horatio Hackett Newman. D. Appleton and Company, New York. 1924. Pp. 427.

SCIENCE AS REVELATION. By John M. Watson. The Macmillan Co. New York. 1925. Pp. 303.

The appeal which these books make to the present reader is chiefly, though not exclusively, historical. Historical, first in the sense that they register the opinions of some of the more thoughtful and scholarly men of the day, in England and in America — regarding the inter-relations of modern science and religion. Secondly, in the sense that they summarize in a convenient form the principal findings and theories of contemporary science, some at least of which findings and theories may be utilized as religious auxiliaries. The books therefore as informative in both these respects deserve the attention of the readers of this REVIEW.

So far as their speculative elements are concerned, their thought value in regard to philosophy and theology, they are of less importance. Each of them manifests the weakness inseparable from the Protestant world-view, namely an incurable subjectivism—incurable because unrecognized and perhaps in the concrete unrecognizable by those whom it affects. This of course is an imputation which may with apparently equal justice be retorted upon those who make it. The Catholic thinker may likewise be called a subjectivist by his Protestant brother. True, but the difference is that the former recognizes his limitation and makes allowance for it, as does the astronomer in his calculations. The Protestant thinker fails to make the allowance, claiming that his subjectivism is the only attitude possible. We allude, it need hardly be said, to the non-Catholic conception of religion as primarily a personal *experience,* a subjective state or event —primarily feeling, emotion, with a somewhat more or less intellec-

tual ingredient. Hence the hopelessness of all Protestant attempts at Christian Reunion—a hopelessness which is all the more hopeless seeing that it is by a singular paradoxicality proclaimed to be desirable. To quote the view of Troeltsch presented by Professor Webb in the first of the volumes at hand: "In politics, morality, art, religion, it is vain to pretend that all men are even on the road to unanimity. Nor is it in reality desirable that they should be. Individuality, whether in a single human being, a nation, or a school of thought, is what we value most of all; and reverence for individuality encourages the cultivation of what is most distinctive and characteristic in each individual. What unites us is, as a celebrated jest of Goethe's reminds us, not what is distinguished but what is common. It is in the dissimilarity of the *dramatis personae* that the interest of the action lies, whether in private life or on the larger stage of universal history" (p. 337).

By reason of the religious and philosophical individualism which pervades as a spirit each of the volumes before us it would be simply impossible to indicate here the innumerable passages in these books from which the Catholic thinker is obliged to dissent. On the other hand he may be fully appreciative of the considerable amount of stimulating thought and useful information which each of these volumes contains. Thus, as regards the first on the list, Lord Balfour's insistence on the reality of the spiritual, the super-material, world is a sound and a welcome admission from so eminent a writer. Professor Malinowski says many interesting and curious things on Magic, Science, and Religion. But, to omit from a bibliography which finds place for such superficial thinkers as Tylor and even Frazer, the incomparable investigations of Dr. Schmidt in *Anthropos* or of P. Le Roy's *Religion of the Primitives,* is, to say the least, regrettable. Professor Aliotta's paper on "Science and Religion in the Nineteenth Century" contains much wholesome thought, albeit marred by certain infiltrations of pragmatism. "The Domain of Physical Science" by Professor Eddington is a valuable because it is an unusually critical and objective treatise. "Mechanistic Biology and the Religious Consciousness" by Professor Needham (the editor of the volume) embodies a criticism of Neo-Vitalism and a defence of Mechanicism. The latter half is stronger than the first. It fails to account for the directive control of the chemical elements and too easily disposes of the arguments adduced by Driesch, Haldane, and Arthur Thompson. Mechanistic biology, he declares, "has ever been regarded with aversion by theology, mysticism and idealist philosophy. Democritus and Plato, Lucretius and Tertullian . . . and the Oxford Conference of 1924 all exemplify this statement" (p.

257). On the other hand, while contending for the physico-chemical explanation in the realm of *physical life,* he admits that bio-chemistry and bio-physics have no authority in the world of *mind.*

Principal Oman's paper on the "Sphere of Religion" and Dr. Brown's study of "Religion and Psychology", while in various ways helpfully suggestive, take too much account of the subjective aspects and influence of religion and too little account of the objective nature and content. They deal more with religiousness than with religion and are therefore typical of the Protestant attitude and limitations. The same is true on the whole of Professor Webb's essay on "Science, Christianity and Modern Civilization".

The concluding paper by Dean Inge offers a summary of the preceding chapters. Whether or not the Dean deserves the epithet "gloomy", it were perhaps unkind to decide. Certainly, however, in the present case his outlook on the future is not hilarious. Regarding the future of Christianity as an institution—the fate of the Churches—he finds "from the point of view of these essays to be not a matter of supreme importance". Indeed it is even possible, he thinks, though he refuses to sponsor the opinion, "to speculate whether the religion of Christ might not be a greater power in the world if its professional custodians were removed". As a great historical institution Christianity can be characterized as "the religion of the white race" (p. 387). "Organized religion is not, in modern times, one of the strongest forces in human affairs. As compared with patriotism and revolutionary aims, it has shown itself lamentably weak. The strength of Christianity is in transforming the lives of individuals — of a small minority, certainly, as Christ clearly predicted, but a large number in the aggregate. To rescue a little flock, here and there, from materialism, selfishness, and hatred, is the task of the Church of Christ in all ages alike, and there is no likelihood that it will ever be otherwise."

While the work just noticed may be taken to embody views typical of non-Catholic opinion prevailing at centres of thought in England, the second on our list may be regarded as expressing the views of thinkers on the same lines in this country. The editor, Professor Mathews, who has contributed the introduction and the concluding portion of the volume, is well known as the Dean of the Chicago University. The main contents of the volume comprise papers by various members of the Faculty of the same University. Under the heading "The World Given by Science" there are papers dealing with scientific method, the structure of matter, the making of the earth, the nature of life, plant life, animal evolution, social evolu-

tion, mind and evolution. Under the caption "Scientific Coöperation" there are chapters treating respectively of recent contributions of medicine to human welfare, of eugenics, of what science has done for agriculture and of sanitation.

In the concluding part Dr. Mathews discusses the evolution of religion, scientific method and religion, how science justifies the religious life, and how it gives content to religious thought. The portion of the volume wherein many of the facts of the various sciences and considerable of the theories held by eminent scientists are summed up is interesting and otherwise valuable. This is especially true of the chapter on the structure of matter, the structure of the cosmos, and the making of our earth. Each of these is the work of a recognized authority, an expert in his field. The other chapters on scientific topics are of varying importance and merit. To point out the large number of statements with which a Catholic student is unable to agree would be impossible within the limits of this notice. To do so, however, is unnecessary, seeing that the aim here is not to discuss theories or to evaluate views but simply to advise the reader that the book is one which, so far as it is a record of representative authorities, it will interest him to know.

Mr. Watson is persuaded that mankind needs a New Religion and a New Revelation. Both are to come from the various sciences. There is but one Allah, Energy, and Science is his prophet. And John Watson is his herald. He introduces in turn the astronomer, physicist, chemist, biologist, geologist, paleontologist, anthropologist, psychologist, ethician, philosopher. To each a chapter is devoted and the message of each is: "In the Beginning, Energy, law, order, cosmos": Energy again, for Energy is first and last. It is God. "The God of nature, Energy, is therefore truly all-powerful, all-knowing, all-present; omnipotent, because all things that have been made have been made by it; omniscient, because there is nothing more to be known than the truths of the cosmos created by it; omnipresent, because its energy is found at work everywhere throughout the universe. The conception of energy supplied by the sciences therefore measures up to the grandest conceptions which man has ever been able to evolve concerning the nature of God. Furthermore, the new conception of God in the light of all sciences as the intelligent energy, with many forms but a single identity, that fills the universe is a thousand times more convincing than our former conceptions of Deity" (p. 283). The New Religion is therefore a scientific religion. There is no super-natural and all is revelation. For Nature is all. What we are inclined to call supernatural is only

some piece of revelation "as yet not understood but which we shall one day learn to translate" (p. 294). When Mr. Watson *allows* the astronomer, physicist and chemist to tell of the wonderful things which they see with their telescopes, spectroscopes, microscopes, one may be interested and in a measure informed. When Mr. Watson *bids* the biologist, anthropologist, psychologist, ethician, philosopher speak, one listens with less interest. Indeed one is continually distracted by the consciousness that these learned gentlemen are but partly delivering their own discoveries or legitimate inferences. Most of what they say is simply a rehearsal of Mr. Watson's own promptings, and it is quite certain that these promptings are frequently far from being scientific. Indeed the reader is warned of their probable untruth. Science he is reminded at the very start "does not claim to have any final knowledge in any department of research. New discoveries of truth at any time may expose fallacy in what had formerly been accepted as truth" (p. 8). Nevertheless when he reaches the end of the volume he is told that the creed of the New Religion is clearly and definitely expressed in the systems of the laws of cosmic energy. "We must learn to look upon the texts of astronomy, of physics, of chemistry, of biology, of psychology, of bodily and mental and moral health and man's just relations to other men and to all creation as but different books of the sacred Bible; each filling a place which it has made for itself in the edification and improvement of the human race, and all together constituting the most holy writings that ever came from the pen of man. Nowhere the slightest contradiction from first to last, but everywhere the most beautiful and perfect harmony, they present a religious philosophy that not only compels our highest respect and reverence, but is truly invincible. It is worth noting here that this Bible of the New Religion of the future is a believable text. Its teachings are demonstrable. Their truth and power and infinity are inescapable. The strength and beauty of the New Religion lies here; every portion of its creed is demonstrable; and every article in it is in harmony with, and is supported by, every other article. It is therefore the Religion of Universal Truth, and its acceptance must inevitably follow an understanding of the harmony and immutable power of Truth" (p. 284). Surely Mr. Watson must be "drunk with new wine". Else why this raving? How the fallibility of science which he confesses at the beginning of his book can be reconciled with the infallibility which he proclaims at the end, he nowhere explains. Possibly he is endowed with some sort of Hegelian intuition whereby contradictories are resolved by being dissolved. It is to be feared that Mr. Watson is like the unfortunates in Plato's cave who, chained to their benches and with their backs to the open day, forever gaze upon the passing

shadows reflected upon the opposite wall—shadows which they take to be human realities. He needs to break his bonds and turn his face to the light.

ONE REAL THING. By Benedict Williamson. With a preface by His Eminence Cardinal Gasquet. B. Herder Book Co.: St. Louis, Mo. 1925. Pp. xv-221.

If you pass from a perusal of the three volumes on religion reviewed above to the book here under notice you get a feeling analogous to the sensation experienced by one who, after spending some time in the tropical lowlands, climbs to the higher flanks of the mountains. Down in the valleys amidst the luxuriant vegetation you may for a while feel comfortable. The flowers are gay, the odors fragrant, the fruits luscious. But the air soon begins to weigh heavily, the sensuous luxury to pall, the muscles lose their tone, and life slips into coma. Get you aloft to the heights where the cooling wind blows down from the snows if you would tone up your languid frame and make you move and feel all alive. Masses of colorful imagery, a luxuriance of feeling, a jingle of speculations and theories, but very little robust vigorous thinking, pervade the modern literature of religion. On the other hand, hard, strong facts, direct forceful presentation of religion based on reason unwaveringly pointed toward revelation, to Christ speaking with power, to His Church teaching with authority and to both demanding and commanding supernatural faith—these form the very warp and woof of *The One Real Thing*. The Catholic Church is the greatest outstanding fact of the Christian ages. She was established by the Incarnate, the very son of God, to give certainty to men regarding their origin, their duty, their destiny, and to supply them with the means and helps to pass safely through time that they might not miss eternity. These facts and truths and a wealth of their implications are established, explained, inculcated by Fr. Williamson. He speaks plainly, forcefully, eloquently, illustrating his thoughts and arguments by many incidents drawn from his experiences as chaplain at the front. The facts and truths are ancient, but like beauty they are ever new, and the author makes them vivid, compelling by the sheer force of his own sincerity and their reasonableness. His point of view embraces the supernatural source and order of religious truth and means, and is unlikely to satisfy those who recognize no other than the one upon which—the viewpoint, namely, which makes religion simply one of the phases of the evolutionary process — the foregoing works are based. On the other hand, the quest of the One Real Thing can hardly fail to touch and move those who are eager to know and are ready to embrace the

Real Thing, when found; while those who already possess the pearl of great price will appreciate its value and cherish their possession all the more by seeing it presented and defended in these vigorous pages.

A few inaccuracies of statement have apparently escaped the author's attention. For instance there is a confusion of *contraries* with *contradictories* at page x. It is not true that "a thing is black or it is white". It must either be black or *not* black. It needn't be white. It may be red, yellow, blue, what not. There are, however, no *blue men* as stated at page 16! Yellow is doubtless meant in this case. Again, it is untrue to say that "the unity" (union?) which binds the members of God's Kingdom is "as intimate as that which exists between Christ and His Father". The latter *unity* is *personal*, hypostatic. The former *union* is only *moral*. Again, "the whole secret of love is to bring our will" not "into unity" but into union" with God's (p. 55). It is certainly an exaggeration and an inaccuracy to say that "the *presence* here and *now of Christ's Church* (author's italics) . . . is something far surpassing any evidence that exists for anything in the natural order" (p. 23). It is also an exaggeration to say that "every man (at the front) went to his death in full, clear consciousness of that to which he was going" (p. 53). Moderation of statement is a desirable asset in a book of this kind. "Captivat benevolentiam," to say the least.

THE SACRAMENTARY (Liber Sacramentorum). Historical and Liturgical Notes on the Roman Missal. By Ildefonso Schuster, Abbot of the Monastery of St. Paul without the Walls. Translated from the Italian by Arthur Levelis-Marke, M.A. Vol. II, Parts 3 and 4. Benziger Brothers: New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1925. Pp. 428.

The eminent Benedictine Abbot's classical work, which in its Italian edition we noticed together with its first translated volume, opens new fields of historic information and beauty regarding the sacramental liturgy of the Church. We are carried back in spirit as well as in the letter of documents to the early days of Christian worship at Rome, taking the reader at times to Jerusalem and the Eastern churches, and reviving all the charm that attaches to the archaic types of prayer used at the Love Feasts and in the assemblies of the faithful while still within the living memory of the persecutions and of the catacombs.

The present stately volume covers the periods from Septuagesima to Easter, including the full Easter Cycle. It is especially timely for use in preaching and spiritual reading. A particularly interest-

ing and to many a wholly new portion of liturgical study is the so-called "Baptism by the Spirit and by Fire" during the Paschal season, which includes the "Eucharistia Lucernaris" and the Feast of Roses, besides some quaint liturgical rites common in the Middle Ages. We learn much also that is new about the Ambrosian Rite and the practice of chant in the Milanese, the Lyonese and Armenian churches. The volume is one of the most informing additions to the library of clerics published within the past year.

CATHOLICISM, CAPITALISM OR COMMUNISM. By Jeremiah C. Harrington, A.B., S.B.T., Professor of Moral Theology and Ethics at the St. Paul Seminary. With a Preface by the Rev. John A. Ryan, D.D., LL.D. With an Introduction by Ralph Adams Cram, Litt. D., LL.D. With an Epilogue by Gilbert K. Chesterton. The E. M. Lohmann Co., St. Paul, Minn. 1926. Pp. 445.

"The average Catholic is fairly well acquainted with the attitude of the Church toward the salvation of the individual soul; but he is not as well acquainted as he should be with the fact that the same Church has a very comprehensive and definite attitude toward group life." Nevertheless "there is such a thing as an authoritative Catholic doctrine in industrial, social and political institutions and relations. In other words, there is a fairly definite Catholic viewpoint in social science," i. e. the systematic study of the social organism. To exhibit the leading principles of this science and the body of conclusions which logically and experimentally flow from them is the main object of this book. The work is not a philosophy of the State, nor a treatise on Sociology or Ethics, albeit it embraces elements and features of each of these disciplines.

It is before all else a practical manual, based on the lessons taught by *economic history* and the age-long experience of Catholicism: the experience which is embodied in the encyclical teachings of Pontiffs like Leo XIII. The source just indicated—*economic history*—is here stressed because it is the main source and the strong viewpoint of the treatise. The author shows in the first chapter that on social action should rest "the new apologetic"—namely, the line of argument for the Church's God-given reason for existence drawn from her ability to meet and apply a remedy to the very roots of the social disorders that are eating into the heart of recent society. To establish this line of argument the author studies at length, first the way in which the early Church met the social and industrial conditions of pagan slavery and then of Christian serfdom. Secondly, he shows how she established a new order by infusing her spirit of justice tempered by charity into the Guild-System, the Industrial Democracy of the

Middle Ages. Then came the tremendous cataclysm of the sixteenth century carrying with it the monasteries and the guilds and preparing the way for the Industrial Revolution and the despotic reign of Modern Capitalism, which in turn has occasioned the revolt of the proletariat and the reaction of Communism, Radicalism, Bolshevism. The forces of mutual hatred are now being arrayed across the globe in ever-lengthening lines over against each other. Which shall survive? Probably neither. An intermediary system which is at least in its essentials embodied in some form of Industrial Democracy, and which the present author calls Distributivism (meaning thereby a more equitable distribution of wealth and coöperation amongst the economic factors and agencies), may issue from the conflict. The prospects seem to point in this direction and therefore toward the ideal system which accords closely with Catholic principles and historic experience. The grounds for this outlook and the methods and means for furthering and attaining it are admirably set forth in the closing chapter of the present volume.

The author seems conscious of the interrogation point that is sure to start up in the mind of the querulous reader: What has the Church to do with social science? And particularly what has the priest to do with social science? Have we not been going along all right for years without even starting a single social club? Such an attitude of mind in some quarters is considered even pious. Over against this status the author places the words of Benedict XV, writing to the Bishop of Bergamo on the Social Question. "Now it is a duty of priests and particularly of pastors to combat vigorously such pernicious enemies of Catholic and civil society, with united effort among themselves and coöperating zealously under your leadership, Venerable Brother. Let no one of these think that there is a question here of an activity which is foreign to the sacred ministry because it has to do with economics, for in this very social question the eternal salvation of souls is imperilled. Wherefore we desire that they count it among their duties to apply themselves as much as they can in their studies and by their vigilance and activities, to the theory and practice of social science, and that they aid with all their resources those who were engaged in our organizations."

Let us say in conclusion that it would be hard to find any book better adapted to facilitate the instructional activities of the clergy on these matters. A priest conducting a study club could do no better than to read or have a member read a portion of the book with a view to its discussion at the meeting. The methodical divisions of the text facilitates this function. It is to be hoped that the demand for the book will be so large as to entail a new edition, occasion of which could be taken to correct the typographical errors and to add a bibliography and an index.

Literary Chat

Amidst the clash and din of discordant systems of thought the cry is heard periodically—"back to the past". "Back to Kant" was the slogan a few decades ago. Recently that cry has grown faint as the New Realists are making their voice felt in the more intelligible and practical motto: "Back to reality—to common sense". "Back to Christ" rings out encouragingly from time to time, only to lose its rallying power amidst the claims for the "Ideal Christ" on the one side and the "Historical Christ" on the other. A short time ago a noteworthy volume came from The Macmillan Company's press with the title *The Return of Christendom*. It contained a series of essays by "a group of Churchmen"—members of the Anglican Communion, clerical and lay. The English edition is introduced by Bishop Gore and the American edition by Bishop Brent of Buffalo. The epilogue is from the compelling and always brilliant pen of Mr. Gilbert K. Chesterton. In passing we might mention that the same *epilogue*, somewhat curtailed, appears in the book *Catholicism, Capitalism* or *Communism*, reviewed in the present number. Aside from an occasional expression which a "Roman" Catholic would not endorse, the substance of these essays is thoughtful and solid. This is particularly true of the paper on "The Medieval Theory of Social Order," by Dr. Carlyle (author of the well-known work *Medieval Political Theory in the West*, Vols. I-IV.)

It is encouraging to read the virile protest of eminent Anglican authorities against the plutocracy of English Capitalism and the vigorous plea for a return of Catholic ideals as they were embodied in the guild system of the Middle Ages when England was still "merrie", because there was no industrial war between classes and masses.

It is even more encouraging to find an economist of Mr. Arthur Penty's authority put forth the words of Christ, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His justice", as summing up true political economy. This, says the author of *Old Worlds for New*, "is the political economy of Christendom, and it is because in some measure the Medievalists pursued this ideal that they were not perplexed by the problem of riches and poverty as it perplexes us to-day. Industrialism is the organization of society on the opposite assumption. 'Seek ye first,' it says, 'material prosperity, and all other things shall be added unto you.' But somehow or other it does not work out. These other things are not added, and in the long run the pursuit of riches does not even bring material prosperity. For the concentration of all effort and mental energy upon material achievement upsets the spiritual equilibrium of society. It produces contrasts of wealth and poverty, and out of these come envy, jealousy, class hatreds, economic and military warfare, and finally the destruction of the wealth that has been so laboriously created. For no society built on a lie can endure."

And then after stating that our industrial society exhibits a spirit that shows itself irreconcilably hostile to all the higher interests of mankind, this robust economist continues: "In the Middle Ages, when the material development of civilization was in its infancy there were not wanting men to protest with all their might against the corrupting influence of wealth and luxury. St. Francis, in the thirteenth century even, sought to counter the evil by preaching the Gospel of Poverty, and at a later date sumptuary laws were enacted to put a boundary to the growth of personal extravagance, for many people saw the social dangers attendant upon an increase of luxury. In Germany, which in the Middle Ages was the most prosperous country in Europe, extravagance and luxury grew at an alarming pace toward the end of the fifteenth century. Many of the merchants had become richer than kings and emperors, and vanity had prompted them to give visible evidence of their great riches in the adoption of a higher and higher

standard of living. Feasting and gambling increased, while extravagance in dress became the order of the day. Commenting on this, Wimpheling, who was one of the most widely read authors of the period, said that 'wealth and prosperity are attended with great dangers, as we see exemplified: they induce extravagance in dress, banqueting, and, what is still worse, they engender a desire for still more. This desire debases the mind of man and degenerates into contempt of God, His Church, and His Commandments.' And experience was to prove it led to social catastrophe. The peril arises from the fact that, as extravagance increases, a kind of social compulsion is brought to bear upon others to live up to it, whether they can afford to do so or not, and as only the rich can afford to keep up with the standard thus set, a point is soon reached when the need of money is widely felt. When that point was reached in Germany the same thing happened there that has happened with us to-day." And so on. We would like to transfer the most of Mr. Penty's essay on the "Obstacle of Industrialism," to these pages. We must, however, content ourselves to referring the reader to the book in which a Catholic finds so much to applaud and so little to condemn. A valuable feature of the book is the clear-cut synopsis which introduces each paper. An index would have further increased the service of the volume.

Back to Morality is the title of a collection of papers in which Fr. Slater, S.J., with his wonted sense for the useful in matter and the pleasing in form, brings together a miscellany of brief essays that are well worth preserving. The first paper, which lends its title to the book, shows briefly that the world has lost touch with morality because it has forgotten what morality is. We must recover the true idea from the teaching of Jesus Christ. Of the eighteen chapters two stand out in particular: one explaining the nature and species of justice (pp. 49-90), the other dealing with various reserved cases (pp. 132-173).

"Back to decency" seems to be the cry that should just now be sent ringing round the globe. It is nothing less than pathetic to hear the Vicar of Christ call upon Catholic women to enlist in the new crusade: "Nous vous demandons", said Pius XI in an address to an audience given to the Religious of the Sacred Heart and their pupils, "de nous venir en aide dans cette belle croisade pour la modestie chrétienne." And to win followers to the movement the Holy Father has enriched with an Indulgence of 300 days a prayer to Mary Immaculate, Model of Purity. A very earnest French Dominican P. Vuillermet, well known by his several other practical publications, has recently issued through Lethielleux (Paris) the second edition of a volumette entitled *La Croisade pour la Modestie* (pp. 114). In it he makes a strong appeal to Catholic parents and educators to enlist in the new crusade and points out the principal means and methods upon which, together with divine grace, victory may be hoped for.

Students who desire to understand the current of contemporaneous philosophy in Italy and are not inclined to take up the original sources can derive considerable help from a recent book by Emilio Chiocchetti, *La Filosofia di Benedetto Croce* (pp. 350)—a companion study to the same author's previous volume, *La Filosofia di Giovanni Gentili* (pp. 480). The two works together give a good account of the influence of Hegelianism on Italian thought. Their subjects are treated critically, though withal dispassionately and objectively. And what is hardly less worth noting, with distinction and literary grace. The author knows how to send light even through the fogs of Hegelianism. His critique of Croce has recently been issued in a third edition, revised and enlarged, by the *Società Editrice* "Vita e Pensiero", Milan.

The French Academy has done itself an honor by "crowning" Marguerite Duportal's volumette *De la Volonté* (P. Lethielleux. Pp. 175). Not that the book contains anything wholly original or very striking, unless treating a venerable theme in a

plain and perfectly sane method be accounted such. It is neither a psychology nor a gymnastic of volitional activity. The dominant idea is of course moral. There is no lack of will power in the average physically normal person. The so-called weak will is strong enough for the everyday demands of life, if you get the possessor thereof to *realize* his sufficiency and to use common sense in selecting and applying the motive. By telling how this realization may be furthered, *De la Volonté* will do good service. The book is as charming in style as it is sane and sound in theory.

The Marquette Readers compiled by the Sisters of Mercy of St. Xavier's College, Chicago, are models of what books of the class should be. They are truly educational as regards their contents, typography and illustrations. If envy were a virtue, old folk might be told to look with green eyes on the tots of to-day who are introduced to the mysteries of reading along such delightful ways. (The Macmillan Co., New York.)

A work that attests at once the genius for unification, the Catholic sense and the love of the brotherhood, characteristic of the French mind, bears the title *Manuel International des Organisations Catholiques*. An octavo volume of 356 pages, it comprises sketches (about 500 in all) of the principal Catholic organisations throughout the world. It likewise contains a detailed list of Catholic universities, their various faculties, special courses, affiliated schools, etc. It gives information regarding the purpose, agencies, activities and publications of each of these organizations, the reliability of which information is guaranteed by the fact that it emanates in each case from the original institution or organization itself. The manual is unique, the only one of its kind, and should prove of immense service to the clergy and to religious and social workers generally the world over. It has been compiled by the Abbé J. Monti, the head of the International Office of Catholic Organizations, established at Rome by Benedict XV, and is issued by the "Editionis Spes", 17 Rue de Soufflot, Paris.

Another work that carries a like note reflective of French Catholicity is entitled, *L'Apostolat Missionaire de la France*. In the volume of some 300 pages are collected a series of conferences delivered in 1923-24 at the *Institut Catholique de Paris*, on the activities of the French Missionaries in various parts of the world—China, Turkey, Northern Africa, the Indies, the Arctic regions of North America, the Orient, Palestine and Morocco, Western Africa, the French colonies. The work of the French missionaries in each of these regions is described by a specialist in the field. The result is an authentic history and an inspiring story of heroic labors. (Paris. P. Téqui.)

Since the foregoing item was written the second series of these *Mission Conferences* has arrived; the series namely of 1924-1925. The latter cover the beginnings of the Société des Missions-Etrangères, the uplift of pagan woman in the East Indies, religious conditions in Madagascar, the Marist Missions in Oceania, the Missionary Institute of the Christian Brothers, the Missions in Abyssinia, the Apostolate of education for Japan and China. There is also an inspiring paper on the means and methods of stimulating missionary activity generally. The list of topics indicates what a wide field of endeavor is surveyed by the present collection of studies. Compiled as they are by experts, the papers bring out not only the high lights of the French missionary apostolate but a great wealth of interesting information concerning the related countries and their peoples. It is from the reports of the missionaries that we get the most important and most reliable details of geography, natural history, and ethnology. And so these conferences possess a scientific as well as a religious value.

Catholic devotion gave the month of February to prayer and special practical effort by which the spirit of the *Press*, journalism and every kind of literary work, might be purified, ennobled and gain in efficiency. The

Patron who inspired and presided over this devotion as proclaimed by the Sovereign Pontiff is *St. Francis de Sales,* whose earthly remains, together with the relics of St. Jane Frances de Chantal, are in the keeping of the Visitation Nuns at Annecy. In 1911 the French Municipality demanded the surrender of the monastery and church of these Religious under the plea of making improvements in the town necessitating the demolition of the street in which they lived.

The nuns thus driven out of their home migrated to the nearby mountain-side, taking with them the treasured relics of their Holy Founder, the Bishop of Geneva. Then they began, from the meagre pretence of compensation allowed them, to build an asylum of quiet prayer, where they might spend their days imploring grace upon the world and aid for those who labor in the vineyard of Christ as missionaries of the Word of God. St. Francis, the preacher and writer, had given them their rule. When the great war broke out, they were halted in their work of providing a sanctuary for a permanent resting-place of their spiritual Father and Founder.

Some one has suggested that we priests help them to complete the chapel by August, 1926, for that date marks the centenary since the bodies of the Saints had been taken from the monastery by the fanatics of the French Revolution, in August, 1826. It is a beautiful thought, and likely to secure the aid of the Saint of Sales in the way which the devotion of the Press Month is intended to do. The Holy Father, aware of the condition of the Visitation nuns at Annecy, adds his blessing in the following message: "We bless with our whole heart the noble and holy initiative of the *Religious of the Visitation* of Annecy *to restore the shrine* in which are to be housed the Bodies of *Saint Francis de Sales* and Saint Jane Frances de Chantal and we bless all who contribute to this work. Pius PP. XI."

Lovers of St. Francis and defenders of a virtue-begetting Press might express their sympathy through the M. Superior of the Visitation Convent, Georgetown, Washington, D. C.

Well-ordered charity makes less of perpetuating the memory of generous Christians either during their lifetime or after their death through monuments, even though these stir devotion, than by feeding the poor, consoling the sick, instructing the ignorant in saving truth. Such work is best done by alms to the needy *missionaries abroad,* surrounded by thousands who hunger and thirst for help in body and soul.

Great Controversies by the Reverend Editor of *The Denver Catholic Register* makes good and informing reading for not only college graduates, but that very large class of men and women who find time between hours of useful employment to educate themselves to a practical culture which makes them desirable company among people not wholly given to frivolity. Priests will thank the author for an inexpensive digest of arguments for everyday application in defence of Catholic principles and of facts about the Roman Catholic Church, sustaining the preaching of the Gospel on Sundays. The book deals with the Church as a civilizing force, as a supporter of literary and scientific no less than moral virtue, and as a foe to vice, cruelty, and destructive or excessive Socialism. Here and there the arguments might be strengthened by a more accurate reference to the sources. These may not be needed in a lecture; but they are desirable in the written word. (B. Herder Book Co.: St. Louis, Mo., and London.)

Profiles Bibliques et Profiles Evangeliques by the Abbé Th. Barbot (Lethielleux: Paris) briefly portrays the chief figures of the Old Testament and those who conversed with our Lord Jesus Christ during His earthly sojourn, in such a way that we can vividly present them to our imagination and reflect on the qualities which sustain Christian living. There are three ways of reading or studying the Bible for practical knowledge. One is that of literal and quite obvious interprétation; another is to add the aid of sentimental reflection

or else of scientific criticism, to learn truth; the third is to combine these in a healthy way, so as to assist resolution arising out of motives thus created by exercising the faculties of mind and heart. Our author follows the last. Hypercritics may object to a writer picturing scenes not described in detail by the prophet or evangelist, but which are the natural setting to the realities set forth. They err in realizing the purpose of the Bible. P. Th. Barbot does not exaggerate but explains. Preachers and teachers who can read and understand him will find material for instruction and edification in this little volume.

We print in this issue the *Dubium de Forma Paramentorum* of the S. Congregation of Rites which prohibits the abandonment of the standing usage in the Church by the introduction of other forms (of vestments), even such as were anciently allowed. The decision refers to and endorses the Instruction given to Bishops in 1863 (21 August), but does not prohibit the "Gothic" form in dioceses where it has been in use unless it were to take on the nature of a reform or an innovation, as was pointed out in the March issue of the REVIEW.

Books Received.

SCRIPTURAL.

A NEW STANDARD BIBLE DICTIONARY. Designed as a Comprehensive Help to the Study of the Scriptures, Their Languages, Literary Problems, History, Biography, Manners and Customs, and Their Religious Teachings. Edited by Melancthon W. Jacobius, D.D., Dean, and Hosmer Professor of the New Testament Exegesis and Criticism, in Hartford Theological Seminary; Edward E. Nourse, D.D., Professor of Biblical Theology, and Instructor in New Testament Canonicity and Textual Criticism, in Hartford Theological Seminary; and Andrew C. Zenos, D.D., Dean, and Professor of Biblical Theology, in McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago; in Association with American, British and German Scholars. Completely revised and enlarged. Embellished with many illustrations, plans and maps. Funk & Wagnalls Co., New York and London. 1926. Pp. xxiv-965. Price, $7.50 *net*.

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

CONSIDERATIONS ON THE SACRED PRIESTHOOD. For Young Priests and Seminarians. Adapted from the original of the Rev. B. S. Piot by F. J. Remler, C.M. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis and London. 1926. Pp. 146. Price, $1.25.

SIX FUNDAMENTALS OF RELIGION. By the Rev. John A. McClorey, S.J., University of Detroit. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis and London. 1926. Pp. 150. Price, $1.25.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL, MODEL OF MEN OF ACTION. By the Rev. J. B. Boudignon, Priest of the Diocese of Puy. Translated from the third French edition by the Rev. Patrick A. Finney, C.M. Vincentian Press, 1605 Locust St., St. Louis. 1925. Pp. 404.

POEMS OF ST. THÉRÈSE OF THE CHILD JESUS, known as "The Little Flower of Jesus". Translated by the Carmelites of Santa Clara, Cal., U. S. A. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1925. Pp. xv-160. Price, $2.10 *postpaid*.

RICHARD DE MIDDLETON. Sa Vie, ses Œuvres, sa Doctrine. Par Edgar Hocedez, S.J., Professeur au Collège Théologique S.J. de Louvain. (*Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense*. Études et Documents. Fascicule 7. Université Catholique et Collèges Théologiques O.P. et S.J. de Louvain.) "Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense" Bureaux, Louvain; Édouard Champion, Paris. 1925. Pp. xvi-555.

DIE LOCI THEOLOGICI DES MELCHIOR CANO UND DIE METHODE DES DOGMATISCHEN BEWEISES. Ein Beitrag zur theologischen Methodologie und ihrer Geschichte. Von Dr. Albert Lang. (*Münchener Studien zur Historischen Theologie,* Heft 6. Herausgegeben in Verbindung mit den Professoren E. Eichmann, M. Grabmann und E. Wiegl von Professor G. Pfeilschifter. Fortführung der "Veröffentlichungen aus dem Kirchenhistorischen Seminar München".) Joseph Kösel & Friedrich Pustet, München. 1925. S. viii-256. Preis, 5 *M.* 50.

SAINT BENOIT. L'œuvre et l'âme du Patriarche. Par D. S. du Fresnel. (*Collection "Pax",* Vol. XXII.) Desclée, De Brouwer & Cie ou P. Lethielleux, Paris 6e; Abbaye de Maredsous. 1925. Pp. xix-259. Prix, 9 *fr.*

THE LITTLE FLOWER PRAYER BOOK. For Little Boys and Girls. By Philothea, a Sister of Notre Dame. (The Little Way of Faith, Hope, Love.) Ad-Vantage Press, 436 Pioneer St., Cincinnati. 1925. Pp. 64. Price, $0.30.

SISTER BENIGNA CONSOLATA FERRERO, Religious of the Visitation of Como, Italy, 1885-1916; or "The Tendernesses of the Love of Jesus for a Little Soul". Translation by M. S. Pine from the Community Circular of Como. John P. Daleiden Co., Chicago. Pp. 208. Price, $1.10.

ZEAL IN THE CLASS-ROOM. Pastoral Theology for Clergy and Religious engaged as Teachers. By the Very Rev. M. V. Kelly, C.S.B. Second edition. John P. Daleiden, Chicago. Price, $1.50 *postpaid.*

THE SPIRIT OF THE SERVANT OF GOD. Sister Benigna Consolata Ferrero. Drawn from Her Writings. By the Very Rev. P. Duriaux, O.P., D.D. John P. Daleiden Co., Chicago. 1926. Pp. 23. Price, $0.10 *postpaid.*

OUR QUEEN'S TREASURE. Prayers and Devotions for May and October to the Queen of Heaven. By the Rev. F. J. Bergs. John P. Daleiden Co., Chicago. 1925. Pp. 84. Price, $0.10 *postpaid.*

STATIONS or the Exercises of the Holy Way of the Cross as practised in the churches of the Congregation of the Mission of St. Vincent de Paul. Prepared by a Priest of the Mission. John P. Daleiden Co., Chicago. 1925. Pp. 64. Price, $0.10 *postpaid.*

THE LITURGICAL SACRIFICE OF THE NEW LAW. By the Rev. Joseph Kramp, S.J. Authorized version by the Rev. Leo Miller, D.D., Professor of Dogmatic Theology, Pontificium Josephinum. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis and London. 1926. Pp. 226. Price, $1.50.

RETREAT MATTER FOR PRIESTS. By the Very Rev. Paul Stiegele. Adapted into English by the Rev. C. F. Keyser. Edited by Arthur Preuss. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis and London. 1926. Pp. 410. Price, $2.50.

SELF-TRAINING IN PRAYER. By A. H. McNeile, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Dublin; Fellow of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge; author of *Concerning Christ, Self-Training in Meditation,* etc. D. Appleton & Co., New York. 1926. Pp. vii-78. Price, $1.00.

HOLY YEAR JUBILEE 1925. Scenes of Rome, the Eternal City, the Vatican, exterior and interior, His Holiness, Pope Pius XI from Infancy to Papacy, the Eucharistic Congress, Cardinals, Dignitaries, etc., Canonization of St. Theresa and many others including the Holy Year Ceremonies. National Exploitation Co., New York. Pp. 24.

ROSARY NOVENAS TO OUR LADY. By Charles V. Lacey. Preface by the Rev. Raymond P. Lawrence, St. Malachy's Church, Sherburne, N. Y. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1926. Pp. 47. Price, $0.15; $9.00 a hundred.

THE EUCHARISTIC CLOCK AND THE CANON OF THE MASS. Compiled and illustrated by the Rev. Anthony Linneweber, O.F.M., 133 Golden Gate Ave., San Francisco. 1925. Pp. 32. Price, $0.10; $8.00 a hundred.

A LITTLE SAINT OF THE MODERN HOME. By the Rev. Bernard Fuller, S.J. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1925. Pp. 47. Price, $0.10 *postpaid.*

LIFE OF THE REV. FATHER HERMANN, in Religion Augustin-Marie du T.-S. Sacrement, Discalced Carmelite. Translated from the French of Abbé Charles Sylvain, Honorary Canon, Member of Various Learned Societies, by Mrs. F. Raymond-Barker. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1925. Pp. x-292. Price, $2.85 *postpaid*.

"A LITTLE WHITE FLOWER." The Story of St. Thérèse of Lisieux. With four photogravures and end papers specially designed. A Revised Translation of the Definitive Carmelite Edition of Her Autobiography. By the Rev. Thomas N. Taylor, Carfin, Motherwell, Scotland; Witness before the Tribunal of the Beatification. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1926. Pp. xxxvi-304. Price, $1.45 *postpaid*.

THE DIALOGUE OF THE SERAPHIC VIRGIN, CATHERINE OF SIENA. Dictated by Her, while in a State of Ecstacy, to her Secretaries, and Completed in the Year of Our Lord 1370. Together with an Account of Her Death by an Eyewitness. Translated from the original Italian, and preceded by an Introductory Essay on the Life and Times of the Saint, by Algar Thorold. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1925. Pp. xxv-353. Price, $4.25 *net*.

LES SAINTS-ORDRES. Doctrine et Action. Par Louis Douzic, Aumônier *Rue des Postes*. Pierre Téqui, Paris—6e. 1926. Pp. xi-522. Prix, 14 *fr. franco*.

IMMORTALITÉ. Entretiens sur le probleme de la survivance. Par Th. Mainage, Professeur à l'Institut Catholique de Paris. L'Univers.—Les Religions.—L'Homme.—La Métapsychique.—La Conscience.—La Raison.—Éternité. P. Téqui, Paris—6e. 1926. Pp. 253. Prix, 9 *fr. franco*.

L'APOSTOLAT MISSIONAIRE DE LA FRANCE. Conférences données à l'Institut Catholique de Paris, IIe Série, 1924-1925. (*Union Missionaire du Clergé*.) Pierre Téqui, Paris—6e. 1926. Pp. xxi-321. Prix, 9 *fr. franco*.

A SHORT LIFE OF CHRIST. By the Rev. M. V. McDonough. Profusely illustrated. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1926. Pp. 61. Price, $0.15; $9.00 a hundred.

THE GOSPEL STORY IN ART. By John La Farge. With eighty full-page plates. Macmillan Co., New York. 1926. Pp. xiii-417. Price, $2.50.

THE LIVES OF THE SAINTS. Originally compiled by the Rev. Alban Butler. Now edited, revised and copiously supplemented by Herbert Thurston, S.J. Vol. I: January. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1926. Pp. xix-412. Price, $2.65 *postpaid*.

SUMMARIUM THEOLOGIAE MORALIS ad Codicem Iuris Canonici accommodatum. Nicol. Sebastiani, Sac. Editio octavo minor recognita. Marius E. Marietti, Taurini, Italia. 1925. Pp. x-659.

DE CENSURIS LATAE SENTENTIAE iuxta Codicem Iuris Canonici. Sac. Albertus D. Cipollini, Ethicae et Theologiae Moralis Professor. Marius E. Marietti, Taurini, Italia. 1925. Pp. viii-261.

SUMMARIUM THEOLOGIAE MORALIS ad Codicem Iuris Canonici accommodatum. Nicol. Sebastiani, Sac. Editio septima maior recognita. Marius E. Marietti, Augustae Taurinorum, Italia. 1924. Pp. 404. Pretium (*franco*), Libellis Italicis 13.50.

AMOUR ET SOUFFRANCE, ou le Problème de la douleur humaine ici bas. Par Joseph Vernhes, P.S.S. P. Téqui, Paris—6e. 1926. Pp. vi-154. Prix, 4 *fr. franco*.

DE ECCLESIA CATHOLICA Praelectiones Apologeticae. Auctore P. Reginaldo-Maria Schultes, O.P., S. Theologiae Magistro et Professore in Collegio Pontificio "Angelico" de Urbe. P. Lethielleux, Parisiis (VIe). 1925. Pp. viii-776. Prix, 40 *fr*.

INTRODUCTIO IN HISTORIAM DOGMATUM. Praelectiones habitae in Collegio Pontificio "Angelico" de Urbe (1911-1922). Auctore P. Reginaldo-Maria Schultes, O.P., S. Theol. Mag. P. Lethielleux, Parisiis. Pp. vi-355. Pretium, 15 *fr*.